

New Series

Volume IV, Number 16

October 1953

# The Review of English Studies

*A Quarterly Journal of  
English Literature and the English Language*

*Editor*

JOHN BUTT, B.LITT., M.A.

*Secretary*

LUCY HUTCHINSON

## CONTENTS

William Browne and the Italian Rastell. By Joan Grundy . . . . .	305
Milton's Hero. By Frank Kermode . . . . .	317
Dryden's Bestiary. By James Kinsley . . . . .	331
Dr. Johnson and Saunders Welch's <i>Proposals</i> . By E. L. McAdam, Jr. . . . .	337
Matthew Arnold and T. H. Huxley: Some New Letters 1870-80. By W. H. G. Armytage . . . . .	346

## NOTES AND OBSERVATIONS

The Benedictine Office and the Metrical Paraphrase of the Lord's Prayer in MS. C.C.C.C. 201 (James M. Ure) . . . . .	354
The Punctuation of <i>Macbeth</i> , I. i. 1-2 (J. C. Maxwell) . . . . .	356
A Word in Shirley's <i>The Cardinal</i> (D. S. Bland). . . . .	358
Pope's 'Duchesses and Lady Mary's' (Aubrey L. Williams) . . . . .	359
The Collars of Gurth and Wamba (William W. Heist). . . . .	361
Clough and <i>In Memoriam</i> (A. L. P. Norrington) . . . . .	364

## REVIEWS, ETC.:

Judith, ed. B. J. Timmer, 365; Anglo-Saxon Writs, by F. E. Harmer, 367; The Arts in the Middle English Romances, by M. A. Owings, 369; John Lydgate: Ein Kulturbild aus dem 15. Jahrhundert, by Walter F. Schirmer, 371; More's <i>Utopia</i> . The Biography of an Idea, by J. H. Hexter, 372; Poets on Fortune's Hill. Studies in Sidney, Shakespeare,	
--	--

(Continued at foot of next page)

OXFORD  
AT THE CLARENDON PRESS

Single number: 10/- net. Subscription for four consecutive numbers: 37/-

# The Review of English Studies

*Advisory Panel:* H. S. BENNETT, M.A.; SIR EDMUND CHAMBERS, K.B.E., D.Litt., F.B.A.; R. W. CHAPMAN, D.Litt., LL.D., F.B.A.; H. B. CHARLTON, M.A., D. de Dijon, Litt.D.; UNA M. ELLIS-FERMOR, B.Litt., M.A., D.Lit.; B. IFOR EVANS, D.Lit.; SIR WALTER GREG, Litt.D., D.Litt., LL.D., F.B.A.; SIR HERBERT GRIERSON, LL.D., Litt.D., F.B.A.; EDITH J. MORLEY, M.A.; ALLARDYCE NICOLL, M.A.; A. W. REED, D.Lit.; PERCY SIMPSON, D.Litt., Litt.D., LL.D.; KENNETH SISAM, M.A., F.B.A.; D. NICHOL SMITH, LL.D., D.Litt., F.B.A.; JAMES R. SUTHERLAND, M.A., B.Litt., F.B.A.; ALICE WALKER, D.Litt.; DOROTHY WHITELOCK, M.A.; F. P. WILSON, D.Litt., F.B.A.; J. DOVER WILSON, C.H., Litt.D., D.Litt., F.B.A.; C. L. WRENN, M.A.

---

MSS. offered for publication, correspondence on the subject-matter of the Journal, and books for review should be addressed to The Editor, *The Review of English Studies*, c/o Clarendon Press, Oxford. Authors of articles printed will be entitled to 25 free offprints and may buy additional copies if application is made to the Editor when returning corrected proofs.

All other correspondence should be addressed to the Publisher: Geoffrey Cumberlege, Oxford University Press, Amen House, Warwick Square, London, E.C. 4.

---

## CONTENTS (*continued*)

Beaumont and Fletcher, by John F. Danby, 374; King Lear, ed. Kenneth Muir, 376; Shakespeare's Motley, by Leslie Hotson, 378; Shakespeare in the Theatre 1701-1800: A Record of Performances in London, 1701-1750, by Charles Beecher Hogan, 379; Poems by Nicholas Breton (not hitherto reprinted), ed. Jean Robertson, 381; A Critical Study of William Drummond of Hawthornden, by French Rowe Fogle, 382; Edward Benlowes 1602-1676. Biography of a Minor Poet, by Harold Jenkins, 384; A Congreve Gallery, by Kathleen M. Lynch, 385; Augustan Satire, by Ian Jack, 387; Shenstone's Miscellany 1759-1763, ed. Ian A. Gordon, 388; Boswell's Life of Johnson . . . , ed. George Birkbeck Hill. Revised and enlarged edition by L. F. Powell. Vols. V and VI, 390; The Life and Activities of Sir John Hawkins, by Percy A. Scholes, 391; Robert Burns, by David Daiches, 392; The Poetical Works of William Wordsworth. Poems founded on the Affections. Poems on the Naming of Places. Poems of the Fancy. Poems of the Imagination, ed. E. de Selincourt. 2nd edition [revised by Helen Darbishire], 393; The Buried Life: A Study of the Relation between Thackeray's Fiction and his Personal History, by Gordon N. Ray, 394; The Ballad Tree: A Study of British and American Ballads, their Folklore, Verse, and Music, by Evelyn Kendrick Wells, 396; Studies in Bibliography. Vol. IV, 1951-2, ed. Fredson Bowers, 397; Annual Bibliography of English Language and Literature. Vol. XXII, 1941, ed. Angus Macdonald and Leslie N. Broughton. Vol. XXIII, 1942, ed. Angus Macdonald and Henry J. Petit Jr. 399; A History of English Literature, ed. Hardin Craig, 401; Short Notices, 403; Summary of Periodical Literature, by A. Macdonald, 407; List of publications received, 410; Index, 412.

VOL. I

I  
(1)  
Italian  
too in  
the re  
and a  
(e.g. t  
peated  
it. Fr  
it see  
subject  
style.  
frequ  
Sidne  
almos

An  
firms  
quent  
Pasto  
of th  
—figu  
of his

R.E.

# The Review of English Studies

VOL. IV, NEW SERIES, NO. 16

OCTOBER 1953

## WILLIAM BROWNE AND THE ITALIAN PASTORAL

By JOAN GRUNDY

### I

IT seems to have been Headley in his *Specimens of Ancient English Poetry* (1787) who first noted William Browne's debt to the Italians. 'The Italian writers', he wrote, 'were his models; and he was either too young or too injudicious to resist the contagion of forced allusions and conceits, and the rest of that trash which an incorrect age not only endured but practised and approved' (1810 ed., ii. 165). Although some later editors of Browne (e.g. the editor of the Edinburgh edition in 1793, and Chalmers in 1810) repeated this statement, wholly or in part, no one seems to have investigated it. From his reference to 'the contagion of forced allusions and conceits' it seems clear that Headley was thinking in terms of style rather than of subject-matter. Yet there is nothing distinctively Italianate about Browne's style. His habit of using ingenious tropes, elaborate periphrases, and fairly frequent paradoxes could have been caught nearer home—from Sir Philip Sidney or some other English Petrarchan, or from Sylvester, or in fact from almost any poet writing about that time.

An examination of Browne's subject-matter, on the other hand, confirms Headley's statement. Browne is not an original writer; but his frequent borrowings show him to have been an industrious reader. *Britannia's Pastorals* is in some ways his personal anthology, and in it the Italian poets of the preceding century—Sannazaro, Tasso, and Guarini in particular—figure largely. His debt to the Italians, however, is greater than the sum of his specific borrowings. *Britannia's Pastorals* also bears the stamp of the

Italian pastoral in a more general way, in its use of themes and incidents, for example, common in the pastoral drama. And although such features seem included in the poem quite casually, and not as the result of any artistic design or theory, Browne does at the same time show by the way in which he uses them an almost instinctive grasp of their original significance. We learn more about Italian pastoral as well as about Browne by studying his poem, for by his ready recognition of its salient features, he draws our attention to them too.

But first for his specific borrowings. Three examples will serve. The first is from Sannazaro's *Arcadia* (1502). Browne's story in the Fourth Song of the Second Book of *Britannia's Pastoral*, of how Pan learned of the death of his mistress, is based on Sannazaro's account in the Twelfth Prosa of his own reception of similar tidings. Each account begins with a 'night-piece', based ultimately on Virgil's description of the approach of night in *Aeneid* IV. In each case the hero has been away from home attending shepherds' sports, and the news comes to him first in the form of a ghastly vision as he lies in bed that night. Each is horror-struck:

Faine would he call, but knew not who nor why (B.P. II. iv. 593)

says Browne, and Sannazaro:

... onde io volendo per paura gridare, la voce mi veniva meno . . .  
(*Arcadia*, 1806, Milan, p. 184)

Each feels so restless afterwards that he rises and wanders distractedly through the woods, until, just about dawn, he meets a nymph who leads him to the spot where he may sadly verify the vision (in Pan's case, to his mistress's grave, in Sannazaro's to his native regions, where others inform him of the truth).

Here it is his story that Browne owes to Sannazaro. He has followed its development and kept its main features, but has expanded some parts and contracted others, and has introduced variations—e.g. the water-nymph of the *Arcadia* becomes a hunting-nymph. He has not translated any passage, and his version is a free adaptation of the original rather than a paraphrase.

This cannot be said of his treatment of Act I, Scene iii of Guarini's *Il Pastor Fido*. Here the embittered, lustful nymph, Corisca, is soliloquizing about the futility of having faith in love. Browne (scarcely, one can believe, without being conscious of the irony of the transfer) puts her words into the mouth of the virtuous, disinterested, and philosophic Remond, in his efforts to persuade Marina to love another shepherd in place of the treacherous Celandine:

La fede in cor di donna, se pur fede  
 In donna alcuna, ch'io nol so, si trova  
 Non è bontà, non è virtù, ma dura  
 Necessità d'Amor, misera legge  
 Di fallita beltà ch'un sol gradisce  
 Perchè gradita esser non può da molti,

(*Il Pastor Fido*, p. 97)<sup>1</sup>

says Corisca, with much more in the same strain. And Remond:

Know, if you stand on faith, most womens loathing,  
 'Tis but a word, a character of nothing.  
 Admit it somewhat, if what wee call constance,

Within a heart hath long time residence,  
 And in a woman, she becomes alone  
 Faire to her selfe, but foule to every one.  
 If in a man it once have taken place,  
 Hee is a foole, or doates, or wants a face  
 To winne a woman, and I think it be  
 No vertue, but a meere necessitie. (B.P. i. i. 646-55)

He has skilfully adapted Corisca's argument to suit his own purpose.

The more your Lovers, more your victorie,

he insists. Corisca had also reflected,

La gloria e lo splendor di bella donna,  
 È l'aver molti amanti. (P.F., p. 98)

And when, after Marina has given Remond the answer he deserves, he continues:

Women desire for Lovers of each sort,  
 And why not you? Th' amorous Swaine for sport;  
 The Lad that drives the greatest flocke to field,  
 Will Buskins, Gloves, and other fancies yield;  
 The gallant Swaine will save you from the iawes  
 Of ravenous Beares, and from the Lyons pawes.  
 Beleeve what I propound; doe many chuse,  
 The least hearbe in the field serves for some use,

(B.P. i. i. 667-74)

he is not being original; he is merely expanding Corisca's views,

. . . e quel ch'un solo  
 Far non può, molti fanno: altri a servire,  
 Altri a donare, altri ad altr' uso è buono, (P.F., p. 98)

<sup>1</sup> References to *Il Pastor Fido* and *Filli di Sciro* are to the editions in *I dramm de' boschi e delle marine*, ed. E. Camerini (Milan, 1927).

at the same time illustrating and making them more concrete in the English way. A little earlier, Remond had displayed the same cynicism in giving advice to the unnamed shepherd:

Women, as well as men, retaine desire;  
But can dissemble, more than men, their fire. (B.P. I. i. 605-6)

He has learnt this from another character in *Il Pastor Fido*, Ergasto, who assures Mirtillo:

la donna,  
Nel desiar è ben di noi più frale,  
Ma nel celar il suo desio, più scaltra. (P.F., p. 91)

Thus much of the amorous dialectic, in which Browne indulges in *Britannia's Pastorals* (I. i.), is directly traceable to Guarini. The other borrowing to which I wish to draw attention is also in this first Song. It is slighter than the other two, but is none the less definite, and it is interesting as an indication that Browne knew more than just the obvious things. The *Filli di Sciro* (1607) of Guidobaldi Bonarelli was popular from the start, but was probably never so widely known as the *Arcadia* or *Il Pastor Fido*. Yet Browne seems to have known it. In Act IV, Scene v of this play the heroine, Celia, having tried to commit suicide by eating a poisonous herb, is revived by the tears of her two lovers. She does not recognize the latter, Niso and Aminta, at first, but believes herself to be dead, and seeing the old man Narete, whom she does not know, takes him to be Charon:

E chi è costui,  
Così barbuto e bianco?  
Forse 'l vecchio Caronte? All'altra riva  
Non ho varcato ancora? (Filli di Sciro, ed. cit., p. 330)

Narete answers her question, assuring her that she is mistaken, and trying to convince her that she is still among the living:

... tu se' tra' vivi.  
E se nol credi, mira  
Colà girando il cielo  
Ir all' occaso il sol, che pur dianzi  
Vedesti in Oriente.  
Mirar al soffiar dell' aura  
Questa fronda cadente.  
Là ne' regni dell' ombre,  
O non si leva o non tramonta il sole.... (ibid.)

The resemblance between this and the incident in *Britannia's Pastorals* (I. i.) where Marina, after being rescued from drowning by the unnamed

shepherd, addresses him as Charon, is a close one. Marina, Browne tells us, thinking

. . . that Hell's Ferriman did then deliver  
 Her to the other side th'inferrall River,  
 Said to the Swaine: O *Charon*, I am bound  
 More to thy kindnesse, than all else, that round  
 Come thronging to thy Boate: thou hast past over  
 The woful'st Maide that ere these shades did cover.

(*B.P. I. i. 228-32*)

The shepherd uses much the same arguments as Narete had used to show her her mistake:

Do you not see the day, the heavens, the light?  
 Do you not know in *Plutoes* darkesome place  
 The light of heaven did never show his face?

(*ibid. 247-9*)

Marina and Celia react in the same way:

Misera, e vivo? i' vivo e la mia vita  
 È vomito d'inferno,

cries Celia, and again:

Vita infelice, a cui  
 Fin il morir vien meno. (*F. di S., p. 331*)

And Marina echoes her:

Alas! and is that likewise barr'd from mee,  
 Which for all persons else lies ever free?  
 Will life nor death, nor ought abridge my paine?  
 But live still dying, dye to live againe?

(*B.P. I. i. 265-8*)

Here we see Browne simply copying an incident from memory, taking a hint from an author, without slavishly following him in every detail. This resembles the method he adopted with Sannazaro's *Arcadia*, except that there the borrowing is on a so much larger scale that it seems to be different in character. From Bonarelli he has simply taken the bare idea and used it in his own way, without being affected by anything else, for example by Bonarelli's lyric tones. But Sannazaro cast a definite spell over him, so that he also caught something of his manner. Sannazaro's Twelfth Prosa, with its blend of natural feeling and 'pathetic fallacy', is a moving piece of writing. Browne has evidently responded fully to the emotion it expresses, and has recreated it in his own verse, reproducing, for instance, some of that desolation of spirit which Sannazaro communicates to us, as he describes how after the anguish of the night he wandered

disconsolate in the chill light of dawn. His borrowings from Guarini, by contrast, illustrate the catholicity of his taste as well as the variety of his method.

## II

Of the three Italian writers discussed above, Sannazaro was the one who exercised the greatest influence, directly and indirectly, on Browne. There are other reminiscences of his *Arcadia* in *Britannia's Pastorals*, in addition to the one which we have just noticed. Some are quite definite imitations: the description of the feast of Pales, for example, in II. iii. 549-54, is based upon a passage in Sannazaro's Third Prosa. Others are vaguer, more a matter of character, tone, and colouring, than of deliberate borrowing. Here Browne may be influenced as much by the work of Sannazaro's successors as by the *Arcadia* itself. *Britannia's Pastorals* has an occasional solemnity, an insistence on the rites and sacrifices involved in the shepherd life, that we do not normally find in English pastoral literature. This gives to large sections of the poem a pagan character rather different from that acquired by a simple use of mythology derived directly from classical sources. And it is here that the influence of the Italian pastoral is apparent. The fullest and most sustained example is Browne's treatment of the god Pan. This Pan is not principally the Pan of Greek legend or of Ovid's *Metamorphoses*: he is the Pan of sixteenth-century Italian pastoral drama. In particular the dual nature of Browne's portrayal recalls a tendency on the part of the Italian pastoralists to develop the character of the god along two different lines.

Following the example set by Sannazaro, Italian pastoralists frequently added weight and dignity to their story by the introduction of Pan, the great 'Dio de' Pastori', into the drama. At such times he is usually a dreaded deity, an awe-inspiring presence dominating the action, as in Beccari's *Il Sacrificio* (acted 1554) or Bracciolini's *L'Amoroso Sdegno* (1598), where he is worshipped with all the solemnity befitting one who is the personification of universal nature, the 'gubernator et moderator rerum omnium', as Natalis Comes called him. But on no occasion, when this aspect of his character is emphasized, is he actually seen. There are, however, a number of plays, the earliest of which seems to have been the *Egle* of Giraldi Cinthio (acted 1545), in which he appears as an actual personage in the drama. Inevitably, he shrinks in stature. This is not primarily because of the increased emphasis on his wildness, his kinship with the satyrs, though no doubt that would be more apparent to an audience than it is to the reader; at no time is he degraded to the shaggy, goat-bearded buffoon that he appears in Ben Jonson's *Entertainment at Highgate*. His declension is

WILL  
not, the  
down f  
human  
powers  
as any  
treated  
attemp  
lacking  
living  
retains  
Groto  
Scene  
sent, a  
He the  
quarre  
boys.  
Fletch  
quality

Fletch  
exam  
awful  
hum  
There

yet a  
more  
sig. I

The  
in *B*  
always  
flock  
are c  
'the  
Yet i

not, that is to say, from god to goat, but from god to man: he is brought down from his pedestal, but the weaknesses that he acquires thereby are human weaknesses. As a lover, for example, in *Egle*, he has no superior powers; he is just as doting, and just as much at the mercy of his Siringa, as any common shepherd would be. The familiarity with which he is treated in this play is in part explained by the fact that Cinthio was here attempting to revive the Greek satyr-drama in Italy. But in other plays, lacking this satyric element, he still appears like an ordinary human being, living like other shepherds and taking an active part in their pursuits. He retains his authority, but it is an authority humanly dispensed. In Luigi Groto's *Il Pentimento Amoroſo* (1575), for instance, he enters in Act I, Scene ii, just like an ordinary mortal. (Ergasto, one of the characters present, asks nonchalantly: 'Che veggio? è Pan che viene ad interromperne.') He then proceeds to show his authority by reprimanding two shepherds for quarrelling, rather like a headmaster reprimanding two naughty schoolboys. The satyr's reference to his master (who himself never appears) in Fletcher's *The Faithful Shepherdess* gives him something of the same human quality, as in the lines:

All to please my master Pan,  
Have I trotted without rest  
To get him fruit; for at a feast  
He entertains, this coming night,  
His paramour, the Syrinx bright. (F.S. i. i. 52-56)

Fletcher's treatment of the god has both charm and dignity. The best example, however, of a conception of him in which he combines both the awfulness of Sannazaro's and Natalis Comes' representation of him and the humanity he had later acquired, is the *Balet comique* of Beaujoyeulx (1582). There the nymphs address him as

Pan, qui d'un ferme accord tes Satyres contiens,  
E d'un nœud éternel les elemens retiens,

yet are not afraid to rebuke him for playing on his pipe when there are more important things requiring attention (*Balet comique*, Paris, 1582, sig. Kiii).

This dualism in the treatment of Pan is even more sharply apparent in *Britannia's Pastorals*. In incidental references the divinity of Pan is always emphasized: he is always 'mighty Pan', 'great Pan, the father of our flocks', and so on. In the last Song of Book II, where Philocel and Caelia are condemned to death by the priests in order that the people may escape 'the wrath and curse of Pan', he is a remote, unseen, even dreaded deity. Yet in the preceding Song, which tells of his love for a nymph (not Syrinx,

but a successor of hers) he had been humanized for us, partly by his activities (he attends shepherds' sports), partly by his very human fright at his nocturnal visitation (his hair stands on end), but most of all by the engaging homeliness of the line

So wounded *Pan* turnes in his restlesse bed. (B.P. II. iv. 641)

This is a delectable picture. The transition from this figure of pathos to the grim deity of the next Song is not so violent as it may appear, for in the speech which Pan makes at his mistress's grave he undergoes, as it were, a gradual metamorphosis; the opening of the speech is familiar, kindly, almost apologetic, but as it proceeds, there come references to the offerings which he has received, to his sacred grove, and to his edicts, and with them he himself seems to grow in stature.

Of course, one explanation of this dualism in Browne's treatment of Pan is that he is following two different sources. In Song 4, as we saw earlier, he is basing his story of Pan's misfortune on Sannazaro's account of his own grief, so that Pan, being modelled on an ordinary human being, is necessarily humanized also. The situation in Song 5, on the other hand, is a variation on that in *Il Pastor Fido*, with Pan taking the place of Diana, the stern law-giver. Nevertheless, there is more to it than this, I believe, and Browne's representation of the character is the result of general rather than of particular influences. The very choice of Pan as the hero for this story of convincingly human grief reflects the pastoralists' acceptance of the god as an actor in the drama alongside other shepherds, while there is plenty of precedent for representing him as an object of veneration and dread, quite as much as Diana.

Another (scarcely pretty) piece of paganism that comes into *Britannia's Pastoral*s via Italian rather than via classical literature is the character of the 'lust-fir'd' satyr, who pursues the nymph Walla until she is turned by Diana's aid into a stream. Such satyrs appear repeatedly in Italian pastoral drama—in *Il Sacrificio*, *Egle*, *Aminta*, *Il Pastor Fido*, and many other plays—and always they are pursuing or seeking to entrap unwary nymphs. Browne's account of how the satyr at last broke down the 'stone-wrought doore' blocking the entrance to the cave in which Walla had hidden herself may even be an inverted recollection of the satyr in *Il Pastor Fido* rolling the stone in front of the cave to shut in Mirtillo and Amarilli. Most of all, however, he resembles the satyrs in Sannazaro's Latin eclogue, *Salices*, whose pursuit of certain nymphs is similarly frustrated by their metamorphosis into willows. On the whole, Browne's satyr is a more sinister figure than his usual Italian counterpart, and he meets with a more violent end, being swept away by the river which was Walla:

See quoth the *Nymph* where the rude *Satyre* lyes  
 Cast on the grasse; as if she did despise  
 To have her pure waves soyl'd (with such as he)  
 Retayning still the love of puritie. (B.P. II. iv. 1249-52)

This introduces an almost savage note, and makes us feel that we are reading about the Ganges or Euphrates rather than about a quiet Devon stream.

One major effect, then, that Italian pastoral had on Browne's subject-matter, was to give it an exotic colouring subtly different from that of the normal English eclogue or mythological poem. And it not merely heightened the poem's colouring; it also deepened its significance. For the pastoral drama is more than a mere animated eclogue, an endless succession of golden-age love-dallyings, although these do figure largely in it. Often the action takes place in a kind of Greek twilight: there are gods to be propitiated, oracles to be consulted, sacred rites to be performed: a sense of Fate broods over the action, and the characters seem small, not simply because of their own innate littleness, but because of the supernatural forces with which they have to contend. The plots themselves, too, owe something to Greek drama and the Greek novel; mistaken or concealed identity, for example, is a frequent theme, and though it secures a happy ending at the last, it quite often brings the story on to the borders of tragedy, as in *Il Pastor Fido*.<sup>1</sup> It is often closely associated with the theme of self-sacrifice, which forms the climax to many of these plays. *Il Sacrificio*, *Il Pastor Fido*, *Filli di Sciro*, all end with scenes in which the hero and heroine, after one of them has been condemned to death for the infringement of some divine or human law, contend with each other for the privilege of undergoing the punishment. Similar situations involving the trial of two or more lovers, their readiness to die for each other, and their subsequent rejoicing at finding that they are to die together, provide climaxes in Sir Philip Sidney's *Arcadia* and in Robert Greene's *Menaphon*, so that it seems to have been a definite part of the pastoral tradition. Browne uses a similar situation in his story of Philocel and Caelia, without employing the theme of concealed identity, but that he was following Italian rather than English models is proved, first, by his basing the tragedy on the infringement of a divine edict (Caelia has plucked a leaf from Pan's sacred tree), and, secondly, by his use of dialogue derived in the first place from the incident of Sophronia and Olindo in Tasso's *Gerusalemme Liberata*, but

<sup>1</sup> Guarini, it is interesting to recall, called his play *tragicommedia pastorale* instead of the more usual *favola pastorale*. Fletcher, too, in his Address to the Reader before *The Faithful Shepherdess* justified himself to the audience who at the original production of the play 'missing Whitsun ales, cream, wassail, and morris-dances, began to be angry' by showing that the play was not that kind of entertainment at all, but a pastoral tragi-comedy. He then goes on to give his well-known definition of the latter.

closely resembling also the language of Guarini and Bonarelli, who were themselves following Tasso. Browne's use of this incident to form the conclusion of the published part of his poem seems to show an almost instinctive recognition of its usual place in the pastoral play, and perhaps, too, a recognition of the fact that his own work was played out.

## III

So far I have been considering mainly the background of the pastoral, its non-human elements, and the actions in which they figure. But, of course, anyone who knows even only one pastoral play probably remembers it chiefly for its complicated love-affairs, its ice-cold nymphs, the word 'virginity' for ever on their lips—till the end of the play, and its frequent frustrated suicides. ('It is the use and custom of one who loves to threaten himself with death', says the Chorus in Act III of Tasso's *Aminta* drily, 'but very rarely does the deed follow.') Reduced to its simplest terms, the eternal theme of the pastoral play is the conversion of a nymph or shepherdess from the extreme of scorn for her long-suffering lover to the extreme of love. But, of course, it is never so simple as that. Usually there is a complicated chain of lovers, endlessly pursuing each other like figures on a Greek vase. The nymph Selvaggia, in the *Gli Intricati* of Alvise Pasqualigo, sums up all such plots when she declares:

Io per Alanio mi consumo e moro,  
Alanio per Ismenia, ohimè! si strugge;  
Ismenia per Montano ogn' hor s'affligge,  
e Montano per me suo tempo perde.  
Ismenia un tempo Alanio amar soleva,  
in odio havendo di Montano il cuore. . .<sup>1</sup>

In addition, there is usually a savage-man of some sort, most commonly a satyr but sometimes a centaur, not included in the list of respectable lovers, who nevertheless, by his love for the heroine and the greater directness of his methods, provides the hero with an opportunity to show his devotion by a gallant rescue, and the heroine with an opportunity to show her boundless ingratitude. In the end the recalcitrant loved one is generally brought to her (or sometimes his) senses by discovering how close the lover had come to dying for love. Before this happens, there have invariably been several long laments and discussions on such favourite topics as chastity and constancy in love, and numerous attempted suicides. The chief speaker in the discussions is usually an elderly shepherd or shepherdess (sometimes there is one of each), who acts as a go-between, alternately encouraging the lover and scolding the loved one.

<sup>1</sup> Quoted by Enrico Carrara in *Poesia Pastorale (Storia dei Generi Letterari Italiani)*, Milan, 1908), p. 347.

Most of these features of the Italian pastoral play are reproduced in *Britannia's Pastorals*, chiefly in I. i. There the shepherdess Marina, finding herself scorned by her former lover Celandine, apparently for having allowed herself to be too quickly won, is on the verge of suicide. This theme of love first won and then rejected is itself well established: it has parallels in *Il Sacrifizio*, in Argenti's *Lo Sfortunato*, in Daniel's Italianate play, *The Queen's Arcadia*, and (with complications) in *The Faithful Shepherdess*. (It also occurs, like many other *motifs* of the pastoral drama, in the *Orlando Furioso*, which opens with Angelica's spurning of her former accepted lover, Rinaldo.) Marina's first attempt at suicide is in the best pastoral tradition, for after considering the other popular methods, she at last throws herself from a rock, as Carino (in Sannazaro's *Arcadia*), Aminta, Filli di Sciro, Alceo (in Antonio Ongaro's play of that name) had done before her. The shepherd who rescues her falls in love with her, thereby creating one of the stock situations of the pastoral play. Marina, seeing his sorrow, urges him to reveal its cause, but on hearing it she repulses him with scorn; Carino, Aminta, Alceo, and others had had their hopes raised and then dashed in just the same way. Even the setting is correct; the swain had shown his love.

whilst on the River's brink  
They sate alone. (B.P. I. i. 356-7)

Carino and Aminta had done it by a fountain, and Alceo in a boat at sea: water was evidently indispensable. Like Silvia's in the *Aminta*, Eurilla's in *Alceo*, Clori's in *L'Amoroso Sdegno*, Marina's conduct appears the more ungracious because she has reason to be grateful to her lover. Unlike these, of course, but like many others—Flaminia in *Lo Sfortunato*, for example, who, wooed by Iacinto, is herself hopelessly in love with Silvio—she repulses him, not because she is resolved to live single, but because she already loves another. The lover resorts to the usual help, or rather has it thrust upon him. A 'watery nymph', who perhaps corresponds roughly to Daphne of the *Aminta*, Serpilla of *Il Pastor Fido*, &c., sends Remond to plead the shepherd's cause, and this he does with arguments which, although largely borrowed from *Il Pastor Fido*, are characteristic of the pastoral play in general. His efforts are unsuccessful, however, and Marina again attempts to commit suicide. This time a river-god intervenes, and the Second Song of the First Book of *Britannia's Pastorals* commences, with a scene taken almost bodily out of *The Faithful Shepherdess*.

The plot of this First Song of *Britannia's Pastorals* is therefore pure pastoral drama. After this the poet's canvas is enlarged, his story becomes looser and more involved, and it is not until the last two Songs of Book II that he returns to this comparatively narrow field. It is curious that the

opening and closing Songs of the poem (as published) should thus be the ones closest to the formal pastoral: it is as if Browne were almost unconsciously drawing the work together and tightening it up at these points. In the intervening Songs the action is still from time to time like that of the Italian pastoral play—the monsters Riot and Limos, for example, who pursue Fida and Marina respectively, are in function not unlike the satyrs in some plays, although as allegorical figures they recall rather the personifications of the *Faerie Queene*. On the whole, however, the contrast between the First Song of *Britannia's Pastorals* and those which follow, in subject-matter and in poetic method, is striking. The First Song consists mainly of dialogue. The language is rhetorical—full of tropes and other figures of speech—but it is also taut and nervous. There is no rich embroidery, and little of that realistic description of country sights which we think of as typical of Browne. The poet hardly seems to be fulfilling his promise:

My Muse for lofty pitches shall not rone,

But homely pipen of her native home. (*B.P.* i. i. 13-14)

It is only when he abandons the strictly dramatic pastoral for a freer, more picaresque narrative, that he finds where his true talent lies. Too often it is an air that kills, this air that blows from the far country of Italian pastoral, ice-laden as a wind from Russia, and had Browne persisted in his effort to anglicize an imported product, instead of describing what he saw about him, it might, I think, have killed his poetry. Instead, when he returns to this manner of writing in the last two Songs of Book II, it is with a fuller, maturer sense of his own powers; the unhappy actors in the drama seem living clay, nor merely china shepherds and shepherdesses, and at the same time the poet's excessive exuberance in incident and description is controlled by the exigencies of the story. (It is not a mere accident that the first and last Songs are the most unified in the poem.) Marina and the unnamed shepherd expressed their grief in set rhetorical complaints; Philocel and Caelia, though their Italian ancestry is equally obvious, use language the musical patterns of which seem merely a natural echo of true feeling.

The effects of the Italian pastoral upon Browne's poem are therefore quite distinctive, although uneven in their incidence. It supplied certain parts of the story and suggested others. It gave a certain exotic paganism to the poem, different from that of the usual mythological poem in being religious rather than erotic in character. Finally, in the stories of Pan and his nymph, and of Philocel and Caelia, it gave Browne the opportunity to show his power of handling real human emotions, more fully than the earlier more fanciful or more purely descriptive parts of the poem had done.

T  
an  
Christi  
dealing  
exemp  
the de  
ship ha  
been C  
an hei  
by act  
these  
reason  
was, o  
It is  
as a h  
and th  
praise  
the pr  
Milton  
in his  
had in  
as his  
them  
know  
what

<sup>1</sup> C

<sup>2</sup> Ib

<sup>3</sup> T

of mon

those

lapis

<sup>4</sup> M

tion',

in Stu

those

agree

<sup>5</sup> A

See al

<sup>6</sup> "

R.E

## MILTON'S HERO

By FRANK KERMODE

THE heroic poem, said Davenant, should 'exhibit a venerable and amiable image of heroic vertue'; this virtue, he considered, had best be Christian.<sup>1</sup> Cowley, choosing a Christian hero, concurred,<sup>2</sup> and Milton, dealing as usual with the substance and not the shadow, made Jesus his exemplary hero. From the virtue of the angry Achilles, even from that of the dedicated Aeneas, to that of Christ, is a long step,<sup>3</sup> but recent scholarship has shown how the magnanimity of the Aristotelian prescription had been Christianized, so that 'the extinction of appetite by reason'<sup>4</sup> could be an heroic agony, and Milton's Christ could debel Satan and appetite not by acting but by suffering. My purpose here is not so much to develop these inquiries as to show that *Paradise Regain'd* contains within itself the reasons why its hero is as he is and not otherwise, and that Milton's thought was, on this deeply important subject, always and heroically consistent.

It is essential, to begin with, that we should not hesitate to accept Milton as a hero. He clearly aspired, in a remarkably unaffected way, to heroism, and thought it necessary to his day labour, 'not presuming to sing high praises of heroick men . . . unlesse he have in himselfe the experience and the practice of all which is praise-worthy'.<sup>5</sup> This is not merely to say that Milton was in love with the breathed and exercised virtue of Guyon; that in his life and work he honoured the virtue which heroically rejects. He had in mind a more sharply defined heroic pattern. He cast himself as well as his Christ in this heroic mould; hence a degree of resemblance between them which has dangerously and unnecessarily been called identity. We know that from early days Milton called Christ 'Most perfect Heroe',<sup>6</sup> what more does he say of his own heroism?

<sup>1</sup> *Critical Essays of the Seventeenth Century*, ed. J. E. Spingarn (Oxford, 1908), ii. 9, 10.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* 88 ff.

<sup>3</sup> Tasso, in his *Discorso della Virtù Heroica* (1582), curiously suggests that heroes born of mortal fathers and divine mothers, like Aeneas and Achilles, will normally be active, and those born of divine fathers and mortal mothers contemplative, like Orpheus and Aesculapius (p. 6). This Neoplatonic conceit Milton appears to have temperately resisted.

<sup>4</sup> M. Y. Hughes, 'The Christ of *Paradise Regained* and the Renaissance Heroic Tradition', *S.P.* xxxv (1938), pp. 254-77. See also E. M. W. Tillyard's comments on this article in *Studies in Milton* (London, 1951), pp. 100-6. My approach being quite different from those of Hughes and Tillyard, I have not given a minute account of the points at which I agree or disagree with them.

<sup>5</sup> *Apology for Smectymnuus; Works*, ed. F. A. Patterson (Columbia, 1931), iii. 303-4. See also *The Reason of Church-government*; ed. cit. iii. 186.

<sup>6</sup> 'The Passion', l. 13.

II. Like Adam, Milton was formed for contemplation and valour, not for either, but for both. He thought of his long secluded nonage as the formal period of preparation for the heroic life. The 'degree of merriment' which, on Dr. Johnson's orders, we are to allow ourselves at the story of his return from Italy, need not obscure the fact that the long preparation was over; the hero went forth into the world. While he was still at Horton, Milton commented elaborately upon his long holding back from the world in the letter, written in 1632 and preserved in the Trinity MS., which ends with the sonnet on his twenty-third birthday. This letter, written perhaps to no one in particular, is a careful apology for his long seclusion, an apology perhaps the more necessary in that his long stay at Horton was only just beginning. His seclusion, he says, is not the result of an affected love of learning, 'whereby a man cutts him self off from all action and becomes the most helpless, pusilanimous & unweapon'd creature in the world, the most unable & unfit to doe that which all mortals aspire to'. Rather is it the desire to be properly equipped for the great action when the time comes, 'not taking thought of being late, so it give advantage to be more fit, for those that were latest lost nothing when the maister of the vineyard came to give each one his hire'; thus he excuses himself from the reproach that, having reached an age to obey Christ's command that all should 'labour while yet there is light', he remains inactive. His is not the crime which preceded 'the terrible seasing of him that hid the talent'; for he is preparing for the day when the talent matures.

Here Milton is conscious not only of the biblical *loci*, but also of the traditional Stoic positions on the life of retirement and the life of action. Apart from an orthodox defence of learning, he has a fairly open allusion to Seneca's *De Tranquillitate Animi*, with its debate between the philosopher and the young student Serenus, whose longing for glory disturbs his studies. The dialogue concerns the nature and purpose of different kinds of retirement. That Milton was thinking of this dialogue is confirmed by the sonnet 'When I consider how my light is spent', written twenty years later. Its opening line is reminiscent of the sonnet 'On his being arrived at the age of twenty-three'; it is as if Milton had refreshed his memory of the earlier poem and the letter of which it was a part. Christ commanded us to labour while there was light; but does he require our labour when there is no light? 'There is', as Warton said, 'a pun on the doctrine in the Gospel.' But there is also a reference to the letter in which this parable was earlier quoted, and the later sonnet alludes also to the other parable, the parable of the one talent which is death to hide. Now Patience prevents the fond question 'Can anything be asked of me in this hopeless plight?' by another amalgam of Seneca and Christian imagery in the sestet. This new seclusion of blindness is another retreat. What is recommended

to the d  
inertia;  
sed mit  
upon th  
priman  
true no  
suum e  
inter pr

Th  
pattern  
but als  
blindn

III.  
mature  
attenda  
his con  
soldier  
destroy  
vain ho  
divine  
spirit o  
sanctit

The fi  
with s  
Crom

Milt  
has C

<sup>1</sup> M  
by late  
virtue

<sup>2</sup> It  
have a  
also ha

<sup>3</sup> 'A  
i. 88.

to the devotee of Virtue who is driven by Fortune from the active life? Not inertia; he is not useless. 'Nunquam enim quamvis obscura virtus latet, sed mittit sua signa.'<sup>1</sup> His proper course is to serve still; for Milton to wait upon the Lord; for Seneca to champion the cause of Virtue. 'Etiam si alii primam frontem tenebunt, te sors inter triarios posuerit. . . .'<sup>2</sup> And this is true no matter what gifts Fortune may have withdrawn: 'corpus quoque suum et oculos et manum et quicquid cariorem vitam facit viro seque ipsum inter precaria numerat.'<sup>3</sup>

Thus Milton, in two poems separated by twenty years, considers the pattern of heroic retirement, and seeks authority not only in the Scriptures but also in classical antiquity. The retreat at Horton, and the retreat of his blindness are alike considered in relation to a classical heroic scheme.

III. He grew up in the privacy of his own family, and till his age was quite mature and settled, which he also passed in private, was chiefly known for his attendance upon the purer worship, and for his integrity of life. He had cherished his confidence in God, he had nursed his great spirit in silence. . . . He was a soldier above all the most exercised in knowledge of himself; he had either destroyed, or reduced to his own control, all enemies within his own breast—vain hopes, fears, desires. . . . To evince his extraordinary, his little less than divine virtue, this mark will suffice; that there lived in him an energy, whether of spirit or genius, or of discipline established . . . by the rule of Christ and of sanctity.<sup>4</sup>

The first two sentences could have been spoken of Christ, and the whole, with small change, of Milton himself, though the hero here celebrated is Cromwell,

Who from his private Gardens, where  
He liv'd reserved and austere,  
As if his highest plot  
To plant the Bergamot,  
Could by industrious Valour climbe  
To ruine the great work of Time,  
And cast the Kingdome old  
Into another Mold.<sup>5</sup>

Milton offers us a Cromwell on the model of the younger Scipio, though he has Christianized the model. And a little later in the *Second Defence* he

<sup>1</sup> *Moral Essays*, ed. J. W. Basore (London, 1932), ii. 226. This is the position, modified by later events, taken by the Elder Brother in *Comus*, 373–4: 'Virtue could see to do what virtue would By her own radiant light. . . .'

<sup>2</sup> *Moral Essays*, ii. 228.

<sup>3</sup> Ibid. 254. Milton may not have had this passage specifically in mind; but it must have affected him, as the passage on preparatory study in the *De Otio* (*ibid.* 186) must also have contributed to the Horton letter. <sup>4</sup> *Defensio Secunda*, ed. cit. viii. 213–15.

<sup>5</sup> 'An Horatian Ode . . .' in Marvell's *Poems and Letters*, ed. Margoliouth (Oxford, 1927), i. 88.

speaks of Fairfax and how he unites 'exemplary sanctity of life with the highest courage'. 'In your present secession, like that of Scipio Africanus of old at Litternaum, you hide yourself as much as possible from the public view. It is not the enemy alone you have conquered; you have conquered ambition, and what itself conquers the most excellent of mortals, you have conquered glory.'<sup>1</sup> So does Milton shape the Parliamentary generals by the pattern of Christian heroic virtue. Scipio, the model of ancient heroism,<sup>2</sup> the true exemplar of the nice balance of active and contemplative, who understood the causes of retreat and was never less alone than when alone;<sup>3</sup> Scipio has a key position in the pattern, whether the issue of heroism be conquest or 'the better fortitude Of Patience and Heroic Martyrdom'.<sup>4</sup>

Christian heroism may take either of these courses, though the latter is more Christ-like, 'above Heroic'. In Milton's tragedy Samson, Manoah, and the Chorus, in the course of their patient inquiry into the true significance of Samson's life, have to treat of this topic. The sham code-ridden honour of Harapha is discomfited, and the Chorus comments upon his departure; heroism is comely and reviving, but the higher heroism is the active, which quells 'the mighty of the earth's' 'with plain Heroic magnitude of mind And celestial vigour arm'd'.<sup>5</sup> But the chorus supposes, ironically, that Samson is no longer to be thought of as an active hero:

. . . Patience is more oft the exercise  
Of Saints, the trial of thir fortitude,  
Making them each his own Deliverer,  
And Victor over all  
That tyrannie or fortune can inflict . . .  
Sight bereav'd  
May chance to number thee with those  
Whom Patience finally must crown.<sup>6</sup>

But Samson is precisely the hero who debels the tyrant by plain heroic magnitude, having with Job-like patience endured suffering. The lesson of Samson becomes clear: God seems to desert his heroes, but does not.

<sup>1</sup> *Defensio Secunda*, ed. cit. viii. 217-19.

<sup>2</sup> 'We would make all men know the order of his noble deeds, and moral vertues, to thend that all Princes and noble Captaines in reading it, should behold the lively image of perfitt vertue . . .' *Plutarch's Lives*. . . . Englished by Sir Thomas North, 1579 (London, 1896), vi. 396.

<sup>3</sup> 'Scipionem . . . dicere solitum scripsit Cato . . . numquam se minus otiosum esse quam cum otiosus, nec minus solum quam cum solus esset.' Cicero, *De Officiis*, III. i.

<sup>4</sup> *Paradise Lost*, ix. 31-32.

<sup>5</sup> *Samson Agonistes*, 1272.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.* 1279-80.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.* 1287-96.

Virtue, the staple of heroism, is never allowed to die, but always rises from the ashes of suffering and acting heroes. This is the new acquist of true experience, that virtue is 'vigorous most When most unactive deem'd'.<sup>1</sup> To the end Milton was preoccupied with the hero as the Christian *electus*, with the reconciliation of Christian and classical schemes of heroism, and the problem of why God apparently deserts his champion and allows him to be maimed and humiliated. *Samson Agonistes* is particularly concerned with the last of these issues, which is raised insistently by the accounts of the Old Testament heroes and also by Milton's own life. The Passion of Christ presents it in its most acute and terrible form. This accounts for that like-ness which has been so often held against the poet.

To make his Christ unchallengeably exemplary Milton shaped *Paradise Regain'd* to contain a hero who complete and transcends the heroic data, not merely exemplary in his patience and heroic martyrdom, but gaining exemplary rewards, which transcend the rewards of pagan heroism—sensual satisfactions, glory, power, even secular knowledge.

IV. The action of *Paradise Regain'd* concerns the primary heroic crisis, the emergence of the hero from seclusion. He is tempted; this is what Milton calls a 'good temptation . . . whereby God tempts even the righteous for the purpose of exercising or manifesting their faith and patience, as in the case of Abraham and Job'.<sup>2</sup> This ordeal is necessary to the Redeemer: 'For that he himself hath suffered being tempted, he is able to succour them that are tempted'.<sup>3</sup> It is also necessary to Christ as Hero; he must be refined for a greater conquest, he must 'lay down the rudiments of his great warfare' (i. 157-8) before the battle with Sin and Death.

Having established the situation of crisis, the poem looks back to the youth of Christ. It had been spent in learning. Like Cato, like Cromwell, Christ had been

Serious to learn and know, and thence to do,  
What might be publick good.

(i. 203-4)

'Therefore, above my years The Law of God I read', says Christ, perhaps, as Dunster suggests, with an allusion to the *Aeneid*—'ante annos animumque gerens curamque virilem'.<sup>4</sup> He aspired to 'heroic acts', to rid Israel of the Roman yoke 'till truth were freed' (i. 215-19); the comely and reviving acts of the chosen hero of God. He is intended to carry out, in his own way, the

<sup>1</sup> Ibid. 1704-5. Felltham offers a striking parallel to the phoenix-image in *Samson* (1699 ff.): 'Brave men never die, but like the phoenix; from whose preserved ashes one or other still doth spring up like them.' *Resolves*, xv (London, 1840), p. 35.

<sup>2</sup> *De Doctrina Christiana*, i. 8; ed. cit. xv. 87.

<sup>3</sup> Hebrews, ii. 18.

<sup>4</sup> P.R., i. 203-4; *Aeneid*, ix. 311.

prophecy of Anchises, 'to teach the erring soul . . . the stubborn only to subdue'.<sup>1</sup> His mother has cautioned him against haste:

High are thy thoughts  
O Son, but nourish them and let them soar  
To what hight sacred vertue and true worth  
Can raise them, though above example high. (i. 229-32)

And so 'The time prefixt I waited' (i. 269), living 'private, unactive, calm, contemplative' (ii. 82) and 'addicted . . . To contemplation and profound dispute' (iv. 215). Now, at the moment of emergence, he finds 'all his great work to come before him set' (ii. 112). The faithful cannot understand his departure into the wilderness, nor can his mother; he himself has a serene confidence in, but no rational understanding of, this vocation. But he knows, as they do not (though his mother hints at it) that his moment has come, as it came to Aeneas and Cato, to Cromwell and Milton.

So he goes forth, not like the pagan heroes to honour, but to 'trouble' (ii. 86-87). He goes not to act but to suffer, not to receive but to reject; to achieve 'by Humiliation and strong Sufferance' (i. 160), and by his weakness to 'overcome Satanic strength' (i. 161). He must resist the permitted strength of Satan as Job did (i. 143, 369-70, 494 ff.); this is a different heroism from that of any pagan. The contrast between these heroisms is a leading theme of the poem, which resounds with the names of heroes who augment or illuminate by contrast the total and exemplary heroism of Christ.

V. The name of Scipio dominates the allusions to pagan heroism, and he is often present when not named. When Christ is led into loneliness,

But with such thoughts . . .  
Lodg'd in his brest, as well might recommend  
Such Solitude before choicest Society (i. 299-302)

Milton is referring us to the delicious solitude of Cicero's Scipio; so too when Christ is 'Sole but with holiest meditations fed' (ii. 110). As Scipio and Alexander rejected women,<sup>2</sup> Belial need not expect Christ to fall to them (ii. 195-200). In the Third Book Satan flatters Christ; he is wise, he is capable of glory; but how shall he achieve it, sunk in his affection for the private life? Glory is 'the flame of most erected spirits' (26-27); in failing to seek it, Christ lags behind some more timely happy spirits who had gone in quest of it—Alexander, Pompey, Machabeus, Scipio. . . . But the answer is firm: Satan is himself the type of those insatiable for glory; and

If young *African* for fame  
His wasted Country freed from *Punic* rage,  
The deed becomes unprais'd, the man at least. . . . (iii. 101-3)

<sup>1</sup> His mission being to the sinner; not, like the Romans', to defeated enemies.

<sup>2</sup> See Plutarch's *Life of Scipio*, ed. cit. vi. 410, 419.

In fact S  
from the  
the ver  
ancient  
In an  
with 'Q  
plished  
than to  
mous, t  
with the  
major  
entirely

The vi  
Job an  
unjust'  
of natu  
the tru  
it is the  
and So  
even th

Sata  
hero.  
know,  
uncon  
dismis  
neglec  
for the  
descri  
displa  
the ol  
four p  
of Ro

VI.  
the F  
Satan  
to Ch

In fact Scipio had explicitly rejected this devil's idea of glory,<sup>1</sup> and was free from the vulgar error which makes honour dependent upon reputation and the verdict of the mob. In no detail does Christ fall short of the model of ancient heroes.

In another place Christ compares himself with the heroes of the past—with 'Quintus, Fabricius, Curius, Regulus' (ii. 446); those who accomplished great things in poverty, or by self-sacrifice. To rule oneself is better than to be a king, and, as Regulus showed, 'to lay down Far more magnanimous, then to assume' (ii. 482-3). This group of heroes is named, together with the Old Testament group—Jephtha, David, and Gideon, *Heros rege major*<sup>2</sup>—in Christ's reply to the temptation of wealth, which is carried on entirely in these terms.

And what in me seems wanting, but that I  
May also in this poverty as soon  
Accomplish what they did, perhaps and more? (ii. 450-2)

The virtues of these heroes are included in Christ. There are others, chiefly Job and Socrates, Christ's heathen type, 'for truths sake suffering death unjust' (iii. 98). Socrates had achieved what might be achieved by the light of nature; he was the hardest of the pagans to reject, but he did not know the truth as Christ and his successors knew it; and the new way of knowing it is the key to the heroism of humiliation. It was not available to Socrates and Scipio, and so no pagan equivalent of the true heroism will do, not even that which despises honour and gain, and drinks the cup of humiliation.

Satan professes his inability to understand how Christ proposes to be a hero. 'What dost thou in this World?' he asks (iv. 372). The answer, we know, is suffer and reject. Satan's bewilderment, though feigned, is not uncongenial to us, however, for in dismissing the old hero Milton has dismissed the old rewards of heroism; and one consequence of the relative neglect of the poem is that the exact nature of the new rewards proposed for the new hero escapes the modern reader. Milton for excellent reasons describes them very obliquely; they are suggested by the very rewards they displace; they supersede the old rewards exactly as the new hero supersedes the old. I propose to examine this process of supersession as it occurs at four places in the poem: the banquet, the debate upon honour, the rejection of Rome, and the rejection of Athens.

VI. There has been some debate as to why Milton, having recorded in the First Book the temptation of the stone, proceeds to an account of Satan's illusory banquet; a device which appears to repeat the initial appeal to Christ's hunger. The reason is that the first temptation is canonical, the

<sup>1</sup> Cicero, *Tusculan Disputations*, II. xxvii.

<sup>2</sup> *Defensio Prima*; ed. cit. vii. 135.

second a quasi-allegorical development of it which is essential to the structure of the poem. Milton follows the hint in St. Matthew, who alone speaks of the angels ministering to Jesus after the temptations (Matt. iv. 11). This ministration, it is natural to assume, was partly of food; and Milton balances this celestial banquet with a banquet of sense, which Jesus rejects so that he may attain to the higher angelic banquet.<sup>1</sup> There is a suggestion of this scheme in Giles Fletcher's *Christ's Victorie on Earth*. In both poems Satan offers Christ a banquet of sense. We are perhaps most familiar with this expression from Chapman's poem, which describes a systematic assault on the senses of the erotic Ovid; each sense in turn is elaborately described.<sup>2</sup> Ultimately the banquet of sense is the antitype of the celestial banquet of the *Symposium* as Ficino explained it.<sup>3</sup> The theme occurs with rich suggestiveness in *Timon of Athens*—the banquet having satisfied all the senses save sight, Cupid brings in a masque for its benefit:

The five best senses  
Acknowledge thee their patron. . . . Th'ear,  
Taste, touch, smell, pleas'd from thy table rise;  
They only now come but to feast thine eyes. (i. ii. 129 ff.)

This banquet is associated with Timon's self-deception on the issues of honour, friendship, nature, and so forth. The obscurer banquet in *The Tempest* (III. iii) concerns the depravity of Antonio and his friends.<sup>4</sup> Milton uses a banquet to enforce the sensual arguments of Comus in his Masque. Now, in *Paradise Regain'd*, Satan appeals to the sight with the beautiful youths and nymphs (ii. 338); to the smell with 'the wine That fragrant smell diffus'd' (350-1); to the ear—"Harmonious Airs were heard Of chiming strings, or charming pipes" (362-3); and then he completes the tale with taste and touch:

No interdict  
Defends the touching of these viands pure,  
Thir taste no knowledge works, at least of evil. . . . (ii. 369-71)

<sup>1</sup> Miss Elizabeth Pope discusses other explanations in chapter vi of her *Paradise Regained, The Tradition and the Poem* (Baltimore, 1947). Miss Pope's own explanation is extremely subtle, but it differs completely from mine, to my regret.

<sup>2</sup> Presumably Cicero, *De Natura Deorum*, II. lvii et seq. is employed in this tradition.

<sup>3</sup>

I relish not these philosophical feats;  
Give me a banquet of sense, like that of Ovid:  
A form to take the eye; a voice mine ear;  
Pure aromatic to my scent; a soft,  
Smooth dainty hand to touch; and for my taste,  
Ambrosiac kisses to melt down the palate.

Jonson, *The New Inn*, III. ii.

I owe this reference to Professor D. J. Gordon.

<sup>4</sup> Harpies figure in this scene, as in *Paradise Regain'd*. There may be some allegorical suggestion derived from exegesis of the Phineus story, or of the *Aeneid*, but I do not know it.

The sens  
pure spi  
The ac  
of Satan  
Tempera  
of sensu  
have at

At the

In place  
queror,  
VII.  
to Chris  
Christ,  
opinion  
spoke a  
altissim  
all thing  
tion in  
*Troilus*

This is  
themes  
resides  
enviou  
reward  
commo  
truth a  
judging

Fame  
Christia  
to them

<sup>1</sup> Tro

<sup>2</sup> Cic

The sensual impact proceeds from the highest, 'the eye itself, That most pure spirit of sense',<sup>1</sup> to the lowest, touch and taste.

The adverbs describing the tone of Christ's responses to the temptations of Satan are always significant. At this point he replies 'temperately' (379). Temperance is not so appropriate to his continued fast as to his rejection of sensuality as it is summed up in the banquet. Christ says that he may have at will a celestial banquet,

And call swift flights of Angels ministrant  
Array'd in Glory on my cup to attend. (ii. 385-6)

At the end of the poem he has his proper reward :

A table of Celestial Food, Divine,  
Ambrosial, Fruits fetcht from the tree of life,  
And from the fount of life Ambrosial drink. (iv. 588-90)

In place of the sensual banquet, the material gratifications of the conqueror, he has a celestial banquet, a banquet of love and of heavenly glory.

VII. I have already, in speaking of Scipio's function in the poem, alluded to Christ's rejection of honour, and I need not dwell long upon it here. Christ, like Milton, distinguishes between honour which depends on opinion—*insipientium opinio*—and honour more absolute, of which Cicero spoke as 'amplitudinem animi et quasi quandam exaggerationem quam altissimam animi' which enables a man in conquering himself to conquer all things.<sup>2</sup> This distinction is as old as Plato,<sup>3</sup> and its most familiar exposition in English is the debate on honour between Hector and his brothers in *Troilus and Cressida*; Hector holds that true honour

Holds his estimate and dignity  
As well wherein 'tis precious of itself  
As in the prizer. (ii. ii. 53-54)

This is the most explicit statement of one of Shakespeare's most insistent themes. Milton develops the idea in a predictable way; the honour which resides in reputation is the honour of the old hero, and it is subject to envious and calumniating time. With it go all temporal distinctions and rewards. But the Christian equivalent of honour is not appraised by the common breath, and certainly does not derive its life from that source. The truth and the rewards of honour are determined 'by perfet witnes of all judging Jove'. No Christian can be in doubt about the distinction.

Fame, I confess, I find more eagerly pursued by the heathen than by the Christians of these times. The immortality (as they thought) of their name was to them, as the immortality of the soul to us: a strong reason to persuade to

<sup>1</sup> *Troilus and Cressida*, III. iii. 105-6.

<sup>2</sup> Cicero, *Tusculan Disputations*, II. xxvi.

<sup>3</sup> *Laws*, v. 727<sup>a</sup>.

worthiness. Their knowledge halted in the latter; so they rested in the first; which often made them sacrifice their lives to that which they esteemed above their lives, their fame. Christians know a thing beyond it: and that knowledge causes them to give but a secondary respect to fame; there being no reason why we should neglect that whereon all our future happiness depends, for that which is nothing but a name and empty air. Virtue were a kind of misery, if fame alone were all the garland that did crown her. Glory alone were a reward incompetent for the toils of industrious man. This follows him but on earth; in heaven is laid up a more noble, more essential recompense.<sup>1</sup>

So the poet of *Lycidas* dismisses his fears; so, in the Horton letter and sonnet, he justifies his calling. So, to Satan's reproaches concerning his tardiness in the pursuit of fame, Jesus 'calmly' replies:

For what is glory but the blaze of fame,  
The peoples praise, if always praise unmixt?  
And what the people but a herd confus'd,  
A miscellaneous rabble, who extol  
Things vulgar, & well weigh'd, scarce worth the praise? . . .  
This is true glory and renown, when God  
Looking on the Earth, with approbation marks  
The just man, and divulges him through Heaven  
To all his Angels, who with true applause  
Recount his praises; thus he did to Job. . . .      (iii. 47-64)

In exchange for the glory which resides in the opinion of the rabble, the Christian hero receives that which is measured by the knowledge of God. Christ's conquest 'unarm'd' (iv. 626) is celebrated at the end of the poem by a choir of angels, singing 'Heavenly Anthems of his victory' (iv. 594).

VIII. In the Third Book Satan offers Jesus the military power of Parthia. Jesus is 'unmov'd' (386) in his rejection. The 'cumbersome Luggage of war' (400-1) is 'argument Of human weakness rather than of strength' (401-2). But immediately, at the opening of the Fourth Book, Satan returns to the argument of earthly power. Milton takes extraordinary measures to emphasize the desperation of Satan's case, for his return to the attack is signalled by three powerful formal similes (10-20) which are all the more impressive in that the poem is so stripped of 'ornament'. The Tempter embarks on his great eulogy of Rome,

Whose wide domain  
In ample Territory, wealth and power,  
Civility of Manners, Arts, and Arms,  
And long Renown thou justly mayst prefer  
Before the *Parthian*.      (81-85)

To this temptation Jesus also replies 'unmov'd' (109). Rome is degenerate

<sup>1</sup> Felltham, *Resolves*, xv (London, 1840), 35.

and base, though 'once just' (133); it conquered well, but governs ill; his own kingdom, when it comes, 'shall be like a tree Spreading and overshadowing all the Earth, Or as a stone that shall to pieces dash All Monarchies besides throughout the world' (147-50).

It has recently been observed<sup>1</sup> that Satan's eulogy of Rome is cast in the form of an *encomium urbis*. The prototype is the prophecy of Anchises in *Aeneid*, vi, but Milton may here be borrowing more directly from Claudian. On the Roman valuation, Rome was *urbs aeterna*, and the culmination of the Roman *imperium* was the great climax of history. When Satan showed Christ the vision of Rome he was offering him the sum of pre-Christian civilization; wealth, glory, military power. Now Christ has truly been shown 'The kingdoms of the world in all their glory' (89). But his kingdom is not of this world. Just as the sensual banquet and the earthly glory have their heavenly counterparts, so the *civitas terrena* is replaced by the *civitas Dei*. Christ could no more be in doubt about the true nature of the earthly city than was the Red Cross Knight when he had seen the true Jerusalem;

For this great Citie that does far surpas,  
And this bright Angels towre quite dims that towre of glas.<sup>2</sup>

St. Augustine tolerated the Roman *imperium*, but expected it to give way to the heavenly justice. The Romans had never made good their boast, *parcere subiectis*,<sup>3</sup> and their imperfect justice would be superseded by the *civitas Dei*. Milton repeats the charge against Rome; and the hero, in rejecting the earthly city makes certain of the heavenly, to which he alludes in the language of Daniel's prophecy of the stone and the tree.<sup>4</sup> Since Rome stands for temporal power and glory, and, under Tiberius, for brutality and vicious sensuality, this is an inclusive temptation, and the unmoved rejection of it is the refusal of all the rewards possible to un-Christian heroism of the active sort. Dunster, who is usually acute, remarks that it provokes the crisis of recognition, the impudent requirement that Christ should 'fall down, And worship' (166-7) which provokes the retort, 'plain thou now appear'st That Evil one' (193-4).

IX. There remains one more temptation before the explicit challenge of the supernatural battle over Jerusalem. It seems the cruellest and most difficult of all; the sweetness of the tempter's suggestions, the uncompromising austerity of Christ's reply, are more than anything else responsible for the coldness with which this poem has always been received.

<sup>1</sup> By Mr. S. Kliger in a suggestive article, "The 'Urbs Aeterna' in *Paradise Regained*", *P.M.L.A.*, lxi (1946), 474 ff.

<sup>2</sup> Spenser, *Faerie Queene* I. x. lviii. 8-9.

<sup>3</sup> *De Civitate Dei*, i. v. Doubtless Milton had in mind the long Augustinian tradition of historiography, which assimilated the Augustan climax to a Christian interpretation of history.

<sup>4</sup> Daniel, ii. 44, iv. 11.

Satan, arguing somewhat too easily, contends that since Christ is not active he must be contemplative. He therefore tempts him with the learning of Greece

let extend thy mind o're all the world  
In knowledge. . . .  
All knowledge is not couch't in *Moses* Law . . .  
The *Gentiles* also know, and write, and teach  
To admiration, led by Natures light. (iv. 223-8)

There follows the glorious encomium of Athens; most modern readers know very well that they are here if nowhere else of the devil's party. But Christ makes a 'sage' reply. It disturbs us that Milton, who in the past had resoundingly acknowledged his love of Greek learning and philosophy, should write this calm rejection; but its consistency is undeniable. The light of nature is superseded by 'Light from above, from the fountain of light' (289)—it is characteristic of the situation that this line should itself be redolent of Platonism. The heroes of pagan contemplation are systematically rejected: Socrates because of the avowed and inevitable uncertainty of his knowledge, Plato, who 'to fabling fell' (295)—an objection to Plato which is, ultimately, Platonic—Sceptics, Epicureans, Stoics—these because they failed to understand the impossibility of virtue without grace. The lack of divine knowledge renders all Greek learning supererogatory.

many books  
... are wearisom; who reads  
Incessantly, and to his reading brings not  
A spirit and judgment equal or superior,  
(And what he brings, what needs he elsewhere seek)  
Uncertain and unsettl'd still remains,  
Deep verst in books and shallow in himself. . . . (iv. 321-6)

It has been observed that the force of Christ's reply is not independent of classical allusion; in fact it seems to me to owe something to Seneca's Epistle lxxxviii, which treats of intemperate learning and the tenuous relationship of learning to virtue. There is a conventional element in the rejection of useless learning which was heard in English long before Milton; but Milton specializes in the Puritan manner, identifying useful learning with the Law, and dismissing, like St. Augustine who is throughout this passage not far from his mind, the dissensions of the gentile philosophers in favour of the concord of the canonical scriptures.<sup>1</sup> The hero willingly forgoes Athens for Sinai, and Parnassus for Sion. The rejection of Greek poetry in favour of 'Sion's songs, to all true tastes excelling' (347) echoes

<sup>1</sup> *De Civitate Dei*, xviii. xli. The whole chapter is relevant.

previous attempts in English to establish the supremacy of Hebrew poetry,<sup>1</sup> and Milton himself had always given a notional credence to the doctrine.<sup>2</sup> Here, as elsewhere, he applies the full weight of his humanism to the anti-humanist cause. He himself was a hero, but not the exemplar of heroism.

Pagan learning, then, is to Christian learning as Socrates is to Christ; as Scipio is to Christ; as the earthly honour to the heavenly and the earthly city to the heavenly; as nature to grace. Milton's devotion to his theme is responsible for the cold, unrhetorical diction of the poem, from which he has banished 'swelling Epithetes' (344) and much that might recall the pagan epic. But he does not make such sacrifices 'unmov'd'; and there is in this section of the poem a profound and moving turbulence.

The last temptation translates the conflict to the plane of violent action. Christ will not throw himself down from the pinnacle; it is Satan-Antaeus who must fall, with such consolation as he can derive from his at last certain knowledge of the nature of his antagonist. At this point the supernatural powers of Christ are asserted, at first simply in his standing inactive. Immediately he receives his supernatural rewards, heavenly glory, and the banquet of celestial love; the angels also affirm his divine nature, 'light of light Conceiving' (iv. 597), and his coming reign.

Heir of both worlds,  
Queller of Satan, on thy glorious work  
Now enter, and begin to save mankind. (iv. 633-5)

X. The whole poem, then, is concerned to establish the character of Christian heroic virtue as distinct from pagan, and to establish the heavenly nature of the rewards which supersede the earthly recompense of the old heroes.

This is certainly in accordance with the doctrines of Tasso in his *Discorso della Virtù Heroica, et della Charità*. There we learn that heroic virtue includes all the other virtues in a nobler recension, but that pagan heroism and charity are only shadows of the Christian type; even Scipio's saving his father's life is only 'ombra e figura della Christiana Charità, la quale nel nascimento di Christo cominciò, & in Christo ebbe la sua perfettione . . .' (p. 7). Heroic Virtue and Charity resemble each other in many ways, and both seek a reward of glory. But Charity is the greater; and it is Charity that inspires the Christian hero.

nun Heroe espone così lietamente la vita per la patria, come l'huom caritativo l'espone per Christo; e i Curtii, e i Decii, e i Marcelli, e gli altri famosi Romani,

<sup>1</sup> See Wither, *Preparation to the Psalter* [Publications of the Spenser Society, No. 37 (London, 1884)], p. 139: 'The Deite that guides my quill Haunts not Parnassus, but fair Sion hill.' And Falkland's verses to Sandys on his version of the Psalms say that Sandys has 'changed Parnassus mount to Sion's hill'. Sandys, *Poetical Works*, ed. Hooper (London, 1872), i. 86.

<sup>2</sup> See *Reason of Church-government*, ed. cit. iii. 238.

Barbari, e Greci, non possono in alcun modo a i Martiri di Christo, o  
a' Machabei esser' agguagliati.

(p. 9)

This is, as M. Y. Hughes suggested, the background of the poem; but *Paradise Regain'd* is self-supporting, and thus far more complicated structurally than is usually supposed. Milton had a terrible appetite for essentials. He took no ready-made theodicy for *Paradise Lost*, no prefabricated hero for *Paradise Regain'd*. We learn, and we find the lesson hard, why Christ is the exemplary hero by watching him in the act of confuting or transcending all the known modes of heroism. We are taught the rewards of Christian heroism by a demonstration based on the superseded rewards of the old heroes. We are shown the difficult victory of a love superior to that expounded by Plato and his equal Xenophon. The 'first and chiefest office' of this love is to die. When the struggle was over, Christ, like Socrates after his victory for love, 'home to his Mothers house private return'd' (iv. 639). The 'heir of both worlds' had shown how the Christian hero must deserve his reward. 'Blessed is the man that endureth temptation; for when he is tried he shall receive the crown of life.'<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> James i. 12.

D  
a Fabl  
should  
Now,  
C: of f  
is as g  
be gain  
of Eng  
... w  
Dryde  
The  
handle  
As the  
the ut  
attent  
The H  
ists in  
sects  
beast  
natur  
encyc  
ticula  
illust  
Burto  
Brow  
fashi  
the ti  
tradit  
Ac  
Ugb  
may  
Chur  
: "T  
Work  
<sup>2</sup> Je  
<sup>3</sup> Je  
<sup>4</sup> H  
The  
R.E.

## DRYDEN'S BESTIARY

By JAMES KINSLEY

DRYDEN'S choice of animals to represent churches and sects in *The Hind and the Panther* has been generally criticized. 'The whole being a Fable', wrote Prior, the earliest critic of the poem, 'the Beasts who speak should have reference to the Characters of the Persons they represent. . . . Now, by his two Beasts how can we Understand the Two Churches? The C: of R: is no more like a hind than 'tis like an Elephant, & the Rhinoceros is as good a representation of the C. of E. as the Panther.'<sup>1</sup> 'What could be gained', Professor Nichol Smith asked recently, 'by calling the Church of England the Panther and introducing a motley collection of other beasts? . . . we do not assign intellectual or moral qualities to many beasts, and Dryden's have no obvious aptness for the role which he gives them.'<sup>2</sup>

The beast fable in *The Hind and the Panther* is indeed unsystematically handled; but Dryden did not select his representative animals at random. As the poem was 'a composition which would naturally be examined with the utmost acrimony of criticism, it was probably laboured with uncommon attention; and there are, indeed, few negligences in the subordinate parts'.<sup>3</sup> The Hind and the Panther were carefully chosen to represent the protagonists in the debate; and most of the other animals typify their respective sects in more than a general brutishness and savage excess. The traditional beast lore which was gathered by Aristotle, Pliny, and other classical naturalists, and developed in the Middle Ages by religious allegorists and encyclopaedists, was current in Dryden's day. The Elizabethans, particularly Lyly, drew on this tradition for literary ornament; it provided illustrative material for the emblem writers; it is part of the thesaurus of Burton's *Anatomy of Melancholy*; it is a target for the sceptical Sir Thomas Browne in *Pseudodoxia Epidemica*; and some of its commonest elements were fashioned into popular proverbs. Dryden chose to frame his apologetics in the time-worn fable form; and he seems to have drawn much from that traditional lore of which the beast fable is a literary product.

According to a local legend, *The Hind and the Panther* was written at Ugbrook, the Devonshire seat of Dryden's Catholic friend Clifford; and it may be that the choice of a white Hind to represent the Roman Catholic Church was suggested by the sight of the white herd at Ugbrook.<sup>4</sup> But

<sup>1</sup> 'The Occasion of writing the Country-Mouse', in *Dialogues of the Dead and other Works*, ed. A. R. Waller (Cambridge, 1907), pp. 385-6.

<sup>2</sup> John Dryden (Cambridge, 1950), p. 64.

<sup>3</sup> Johnson, *Lives of the English Poets*, ed. G. B. Hill (Oxford, 1905), i. 446.

<sup>4</sup> Hugh Macdonald, *John Dryden: A Bibliography* (Oxford, 1939), p. 113; C. E. Ward, 'The Milk White Hind', *R.E.S.*, xiii (1937), p. 300.

Clifford's were not the only white deer Dryden knew. Quintus Sertorius, according to Plutarch (whom Dryden used frequently as a source-book), had a white hind of beauty and supernatural power; Sertorius 'gave out that it was inspired, that it was given him by *Diana*, that it discovered hidden Mysteries, and revealed what was to come to pass hereafter'.<sup>1</sup>

Dryden stresses not only the wisdom, but the great age and the immortality of the Roman church. For such a church, the Hind is an appropriate symbol. The deer, says Sir Thomas Browne, belongs to a class of long-lived animals, 'in moderate accounts exceeding the age of man, in some the days of *Nestor*, and in others surmounting the years of *Artephius* or *Methuselah*. From whence Antiquity hath raised proverbial expressions, and the real conception of their duration hath been the Hyperbolical expression of many others'.<sup>2</sup> But the Hind is, in addition, specially fortified against death. 'A hind', says Bartholomaeus, 'taught first the virtue of diptannus . . . and if she be hurt with an arrow, she seeketh this herb and eateth it, which putteth the iron out of the wound'.<sup>3</sup> So Dryden's Hind, though often hunted with hounds and Scythian shafts (the deadliest of all such weapons<sup>4</sup>), is 'fated not to dy' (i. 8). If the figure of the Hind was first suggested by the Ugbrook herd, traditional lore supports Dryden's choice and enriches its significance.

The legendary character of the Panther justifies Dryden's use of this beast to represent his conception of the Anglican church. The Panther is both fascinating and dangerous to other animals. 'It is said, that all four-footed beasts are wonderfully delighted and enticed by the smell of Panthers; but their hideous looke and crabbed countenance which they bewray as soone as they shew their heads, skareth them as much againe: and therefore their manner is, to hide their heads, and when they have trained other beasts within their reach by their sweet savour, they flie upon them and worrie them'.<sup>5</sup> This legend is common in Elizabethan literature.<sup>6</sup> Lyl refines it to a metaphor: 'How frantick are those louers which are carried away with the gaye glistering of the fine face? the beautie whereof is . . . of so little value with the wyse, that they accompt it a delicate bayte with

<sup>1</sup> Plutarch's *Lives* (London, 1727), v. 177.

<sup>2</sup> *Pseudodoxia Epidemica*, III. ix. Cf. Pliny, *Naturalis Historia*, viii. 50.

<sup>3</sup> R. Steele, *Mediaeval Lore from Bartholomew Anglicus* (London, 1905), p. 105.

<sup>4</sup> 'Scytha sagittar tingunt viperina sanie et humano sanguine; inremediabile id scelus: mortem illico affert levi tactu' (Pliny, op. cit., xi. 115).

<sup>5</sup> Holland's slightly expanded version (1601) of Pliny, op. cit., viii. 23.

<sup>6</sup> See A. S. Cook, *The Old English Elene, Phoenix, and Physiologus* (New Haven, 1919), pp. 134-5. Cf. Randolph, 'Vpon a very deformed Gentlewoman, but of a voice incomparably sweet', in *Poems*, ed. J. J. Parry (New Haven, 1917), p. 171:

Say monster strange, what maist thou be?  
Whence shall I fetch thy Pedigree?  
What but a Panther could beget  
A beast so foule, a breath so sweet?

a deadly hooke, a sweete *Panther* with a deuouring paunch, a sower poysone in a siluer potte.<sup>1</sup> Aristotle refers specifically to the deer as the panther's prey: 'the panther is aware that its peculiar odour is grateful to other wild animals, and . . . it preys upon them in ambush, and when deer approach, it catches hinds'.<sup>2</sup> These notions underlie Dryden's portrait of the Anglican Panther. She is fair to the sight, but corrupt within; and in her discourse with the Hind she betrays her natural rapacity beneath a superficial friendliness and good favour.<sup>3</sup> Tradition answers Prior's objection that 'a hind, who is so quiet and innocent a beast would not in all probability be much delighted in the Conversation of so fierce and Cruel a Creature as a Panther'.<sup>4</sup>

The mother of the Panther had mated with 'a *Lyon* old, obscene, and furious made / By lust' (i. 351-2)—Dryden's view of the relations of Henry VIII with the reformed church. The Panther herself is not above suspicion. 'The *Wolfe* begins to share her wandring heart' (i. 338); and all the kindness and eloquence of the Hind cannot persuade her 'to leave the *Woolf*, and to believe her King' (iii. 892-5). The Lion (King James II) is 'injur'd' by the Panther's faithlessness; and Dryden exclaims 'Oh, could her in-born stains be wash'd away' (i. 335, 329). The adultery of the Panther's dam with a lion, and the suggestion of her own frailty, are allegorical applications of Pliny's account of feline promiscuity:

magna his libido coitus et ob hoc maribus ira; Africa haec maxime spectat inopia aquarum ad paucos amnes congregantibus se feris. ideo multiformes ibi animalium partus varie feminis cuiusque generis mares aut vi aut voluptate miscente. unde etiam vulgare Graeciae dictum semper aliquid novi Africam adferre. odore pardi coitum sentit in adultera leo totaque vi consurgit in poenam; idcirco ea culpa flumine abluitur, aut longius comitatur.<sup>5</sup>

Dryden's Bear represents the Independents (i. 35-36). The supposed shapelessness of the bear at birth<sup>6</sup> accords with the Independents' neglect of external form and organization; the ferocity of the bear in maturity reflects the character of a sect

free of every spiritual order  
To preach, and fight, and pray, and murder.<sup>7</sup>

The bear, says Pliny, corrupts and destroys. Its breath is 'pestilens: contacta halitu eius nulla fera attingit, ociusque putrescunt adflata.' Further, 'invalidissimum ursu caput, quod leoni firmissimum . . . cerebro

<sup>1</sup> *Euphues*, in *Works*, ed. R. W. Bond (Oxford, 1902), i. 202. See Bond's note.

<sup>2</sup> *Historia Animalium*, ix. vi. 2; cf. *Problemata*, xiii. 4.

<sup>3</sup> e.g. i. 327-34, 564-5, ii. 222-3, 714-20, iii. 16-17, 24-27, 68-83.

<sup>4</sup> Op. cit., p. 386.

<sup>5</sup> Op. cit., viii. 17.

<sup>6</sup> Browne, *Pseudodoxia Epidemica*, III. vi.

<sup>7</sup> Butler, *Hudibras*, III. ii. 117-18.

veneficium inesse Hispaniae credunt, occisorumque in spectaculis capita cremant testato, quoniam potum in ursinam rabiem agat . . . nec alteri animalium in maleficio stultitia sollertia'.<sup>1</sup> These characteristics accord with the destructive influence and the fanatical excess of the Independents during the Interregnum.<sup>2</sup>

The bear has a place in biblical symbolism. Antichrist in Revelation xiii has bear's feet. In the vision in Daniel vii are four great beasts, interpreted as 'four kings which shall arise out of the earth'; one of these resembles the leopard, and is given dominion;<sup>3</sup> another resembles a bear. The 'bear' 'raised up itself on one side, and it had three ribs in the mouth of it between the teeth of it; and they said thus unto it, Arise, devour much flesh'. Dryden chooses the Bear to represent the Independents, who 'arose to great eminence in the civil wars, when the enthusiastic spirits were deemed entitled to preferment upon earth, in proportion to the extravagance of their religious zeal'.<sup>4</sup> His choice was anticipated by Butler, who described Puritan synods as 'mystical Bear-gardens':

This to the Prophet did appear,  
Who in a vision saw a Bear,  
Prefiguring the beastly rage  
Of Church-rule, in this latter age. . . .

Bears nat'rally are beasts of prey,  
That live by rapine; so do they.<sup>5</sup>

The hare is traditionally a timorous animal, and an appropriate symbol for the Quakers (i. 37-38). It is also, says Turberville, 'one of the most melancholike beastes that is'—a trait recorded and elaborated by many seventeenth-century writers and in popular proverbs.<sup>6</sup> A refinement of this belief is the notion that the hare is averse to music and merriment. 'You shal assone catch a Hare with a Taber, as you shal perswade youth, with your aged & ouerworn eloquence, to such seueritie of lyfe.'<sup>7</sup> The Quakers strongly disapproved of music. 'I was moved', says Fox, 'to cry out against all kinds of music, and against the mountebanks playing tricks on their stages, for they burthened the pure life, and stirred up people's minds to vanity.' He visited fair-grounds to 'preach against all sorts of

<sup>1</sup> Op. cit., xi. 115; viii. 54.

<sup>2</sup> See *Works of Dryden*, ed. Scott (London, 1808), x. 140-1.

<sup>3</sup> The leopard and the panther are not always distinguished; Daniel's description of the leopard certainly suits Dryden's notion of the Church of England.

<sup>4</sup> Scott's *Dryden*, x. 140.

<sup>5</sup> *Hudibras*, i. iii. 1117-24.

<sup>6</sup> *Book of Hunting* (Oxford, 1909), p. 160. Cf. Burton, *Anatomy of Melancholy*, i. ii. 2. 1. 'Hare, a black meat, melancholy and hard of digestion'; and M. P. Tilley, *A Dictionary of the Proverbs in England* (Ann Arbor, 1950), H151.

<sup>7</sup> *Works of Lylly*, ed. R. W. Bond, i. 193-4 and note; Tilley, op. cit., H160.

music'.<sup>1</sup> Solomon Eccles, a composer, abandoned his music and destroyed his instruments on becoming a Quaker, and wrote strongly against his former art in *A Musick Lector* (1667).<sup>2</sup>

'The bristl'd Baptist Boar', driven from the German forests which he had laid waste, 'lurk'd in Sects unseen' (i. 43–52). This association of the seventeenth-century Baptists with the original Münster Anabaptists, and the contention that Anabaptist doctrines persisted in sects which denied such an ancestry, were both common in Dryden's day.<sup>3</sup> The violence of the Anabaptists of Münster, and their persistence in the face of bloody opposition,<sup>4</sup> are aptly figured in the symbol of the Boar, who is 'so fierce a beast, and also so cruel, that . . . he despiseth and setteth nought by death, and he reseth full piteously against the point of a spear of the hunter'.<sup>5</sup>

Dryden's Wolf is a Presbyterian (i. 153–96). Dryden's authority here is merely scriptural. The wolf is the enemy of the flock and the persecutor of the church; a false prophet which comes disguised in sheep's clothing (Matthew vii. 15). In choosing the Wolf to represent a sect which was, in the opinion of many, threatening the Anglican church by infiltration, Dryden had been anticipated by Butler:

This zealot  
Is of a mongrel, diverse kind,  
Cleric before, and lay behind;  
A lawless, linsey-woolsey brother,  
Half of one order, half another;  
  
That always preys on grace or sin,  
A sheep without, a wolf within.<sup>6</sup>

'False Reynard' is a Socinian (i. 53–61). The Fox's cunning is a commonplace, and he well typifies a heresy based on an ancient intellectual controversy. It is the rationalism of the Socinian which Dryden attacks, both in *Religio Laici* and in *The Hind and the Panther*. Socinianism was attracting and influencing a number of his distinguished contemporaries.<sup>7</sup> The

<sup>1</sup> *Journal*, 1649; cf. R. A. Knox, *Enthusiasm* (Oxford, 1950), pp. 145–7.

<sup>2</sup> See P. Scholes, *The Oxford Companion to Music*, arts. 'Eccles' and 'Quakers'.

<sup>3</sup> 'The confusion in the popular mind was partly due to the fact that they were believed guilty of extravagances such as were seen amongst the Quakers, Fifth Monarchy Men, and Ranters, which extravagances called up hazy recollections of what had been heard of the doings of the Anabaptists at Münster' (C. E. Whiting, *Studies in English Puritanism*, London, 1931, p. 87). But cf. R. A. Knox, op. cit., pp. 137–8 and 139 ff.

<sup>4</sup> Scott's *Dryden*, x. 145–6; R. A. Knox, op. cit., pp. 126–37.

<sup>5</sup> R. Steele, op. cit., pp. 139–40.

<sup>6</sup> *Hudibras*, I. iii. 1224–32. The disguised rapacity of the animal supplies the point of the Hind's suggestion (ii. 228–9, ii. 246, iii. 163–6) that the relations of the Panther and the Wolf have been dangerously intimate.

<sup>7</sup> e.g. Clerke, Locke, and Newton. See H. J. McLachlan, *Socinianism in Seventeenth-Century England* (Oxford, 1951), pp. 323–32.

subtlety of the Fox reflects also the tactics of men who held Socinian opinions but prudently contrived to keep on the right side of the law. The Unitarian leader John Knowles, for example, dishonestly declared under the pressure of an attack by the Calvinist Robert Ferguson: 'I never yet was acquainted with any *Socinian*, I mean, with any one I knew to be such. Indeed I have heard of one *Socinus*, a learned Gentleman, and a very pious man, as the History of his Life informs us. I have heard that he has written much, but believe me, I never read over one Book of his.' Knowles had, nevertheless, a collection of Socinian works in his library. Thomas Firmin, the most influential Socinian in England, was a close friend of prominent Anglican divines, and remained in communion with the Anglican church throughout his life.<sup>1</sup>

It is probably on such grounds as these that Dryden associates the Fox with the Wolf, who together

came shuffl'd in the dark,  
If ever they were stow'd in *Noah's* ark:  
Perhaps not made; for all their barking train  
The Dog (a common species) will contain. (i. 190-3)

The Fox, like the Wolf, is a symbol of the false prophet in both scripture and proverb. 'Thus saith the Lord GOD; Woe unto the foolish prophets, that follow their own spirit, and have seen nothing. O Israel, thy prophets are like the foxes in the deserts.'<sup>2</sup> The foxes, says the Song of Solomon, spoil the vines (ii. 15). In a fourteenth-century manuscript is an illustration of a fox, preaching in a mitre, to an open-mouthed, deluded goose; and Lyly more than once refers to the fox's false preaching.<sup>3</sup> The proverb, 'When the fox preaches beware of the hens', was common in the seventeenth century. Cotgrave explains 'Le regard presche aux poules' as 'Sayed when a notable Imposter talks vnto, or treats with, sillie and ignorant people'.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> McLachlan, op. cit., pp. 279-81, 294-7.

<sup>2</sup> Ezekiel xiii. 3-4.

<sup>3</sup> Works, ed. R. W. Bond, i. 220, ii. 99 and note.

<sup>4</sup> See Tilley, op. cit., F656.

D

A

centur

years

sermo

inform

a new

case o

figure

have b

shado

Bos

We

the Ju

tuniti

when

hunga

diseas

a plac

great

depen

manu

work

he say

then y

We

since

and i

bawd

Penle

induc

A Tr

printi

writing

## DR. JOHNSON AND SAUNDERS WELCH'S PROPOSALS

By E. L. McADAM, JR.

A REVIEWER remarked recently in the *American Law Journal* that Dr. Johnson was undoubtedly the great ghost-writer of the eighteenth century. So much evidence has been brought to light in the last twenty years that he helped dozens of friends with a dedication or a preface, a sermon or a lecture, always anonymously, and sometimes without even informing Boswell, that it will hardly surprise scholars to be presented with a new instance of Johnsonian assistance. It is pleasant, however, that this case concerns a man who was an intimate friend for many years, who figures several times in Boswell's *Johnson*, and yet about whom the editors have been able to supply so little information that he has remained a very shadowy figure—Saunders Welch.

Boswell records only one conversation with Johnson about Welch:

We talked of the state of the poor in London.—JOHNSON. "Saunders Welch, the Justice, who was once High-Constable of Holborn, and had the best opportunities of knowing the state of the poor, told me, that I under-rated the number, when I computed that twenty a week, that is, above a thousand a year, died of hunger; not absolutely of immediate hunger; but of the wasting and other diseases which are the consequences of hunger. This happens only in so large a place as London, where people are not known. What we are told about the great sums got by begging is not true: the trade is overstocked. And, you may depend upon it, there are many who cannot get work. A particular kind of manufacture fails: those who have been used to work at it, can, for some time, work at nothing else. You meet a man begging; you charge him with idleness: he says, 'I am willing to labour. Will you give me work?'—'I cannot.'—'Why, then you have no right to charge me with idleness.'"<sup>1</sup>

Welch's opportunity for observing the London poor had been official since about 1744. He had served as High Constable under Henry Fielding, and in 1749 he assisted Fielding in suppressing the riot in which three bawdy-houses were gutted by the mob, as a result of which one Bosavern Penlez was executed. Adverse criticism of the severity of the sentence induced Fielding to defend his part in the case in his pamphlet of that year, *A True State of the Case of Bosavern Penlez*, where Welch's deposition is printed. Since I hope to prove that Johnson later helped Welch in his writing, it should be pointed out here that the deposition is in a plain and

<sup>1</sup> *Life*, ed. Hill-Powell, iii. 401.

totally undistinguished style, which is perhaps all one should expect in such a document. Fielding described Welch, however, as 'one of the best officers who was ever concerned in the execution of justice',<sup>1</sup> and in December 1753 recommended to the Lord Chancellor that he be appointed a Justice of the Peace, to which office he was finally appointed in April 1755.

Meanwhile, Welch had written, in 1753, a very long letter to the Lord Treasurer, the Duke of Newcastle, at the Duke's request, on 'the frequent Murders and Robberies so justly and universally complained of', a subject Fielding had written on two years earlier. This is a workmanlike discussion in which Welch first proposes that migrant labourers carry certificates of character and identification, with penalties for hiring or lodging those not so provided. He then discusses the promiscuous lairs of thieves in 'old ruinous Buildings' in the 'Out-Skirts of this Town' whence 'Great Numbers of desperate Villains' have been taken and executed ('A few Years ago I assisted Mr. Henry Fielding in taking from under one Roof upwards of seventy Lodgers of both Sexes'). He next proposes the establishment of 'some Hospital' to receive, educate, and employ children of the poor, in order to save them from lives of crime; and the founding of other hospitals to rehabilitate prostitutes. Finally he urges the suppression of gambling, the separation of felons from less serious offenders in prisons, payment of jailers by salary instead of perquisites, and better lighting of the streets. This long list shows sincere humanity, a comprehensive knowledge of an urban magistrate's problems, and a considerable ingenuity in suggesting practicable reforms, rather than merely increased severity of punishment which was the more usual recommendation at this period. These qualities would undoubtedly have appealed to Johnson, whose humanity in dealing with beggars and prostitutes is well known.

Whether Johnson and Welch had met in 1753 is uncertain. Boswell said that their friendship was 'long and intimate', and as Welch left the bench in 1776 because of ill health, the date may not be too early. Hawkins states that when Johnson wished to visit Cock Lane to investigate the reported appearance of a ghost, 'Mr. Saunders Welch, his intimate friend, would have dissuaded him from his purpose, urging, that it would expose him to ridicule'.<sup>2</sup> Since this was in January 1762, it is conceivable that Johnson knew him at least as early as 1753, particularly since Johnson referred to him as the justice 'who was once High-Constable of Holborn', which office he vacated in April 1755. At any rate, Boswell adds that Johnson 'attended Mr. Welch in his office for a whole winter, to hear the examination of the culprits'.<sup>3</sup> As Welch was not a writer by profession, what more likely than that he should, sooner or later, ask Johnson's help when he had a pamphlet to publish or an official letter to write to the Lord Treasurer? That

<sup>1</sup> *Life*, iii. 514.

<sup>2</sup> *Johnson*, p. 437.

<sup>3</sup> *Life*, iii. 216.

DR. J.  
Johnson  
a sente  
otherw  
tions; a  
the bu  
the Lo  
unnam  
and fin

In 1  
the co  
Cross  
eviden  
tionatu  
caused

But  
may s  
good l  
mind,  
(p. 46

The  
Welc  
panie  
press  
least  
is a f  
ness  
in th  
tion'  
office

W  
using  
Dr. J  
pous  
amur  
been  
away  
was

1  
and  
Mon  
cons  
in or

## DR. JOHNSON AND SAUNDERS WELCH'S PROPOSALS 339

Johnson did help in the letter is very doubtful. There are phrases or a sentence or two which might be his ('The Sacred Name of God is no otherwise known to them [children of the poor], but by dreadful execrations; and Religion is first taught them by the Ordinary of Newgate'), but the bulk of the letter is undistinguished in style. It was first published in the *London Chronicle* for 14–17 January 1758, to which it was sent by an unnamed person in the Treasury. It was reprinted in *Lloyd's Evening Post*, and finally printed by Welch as an appendix to a pamphlet.

In 1754 Welch published a forty-six-page pamphlet for the guidance of the constabulary in their duties, *Observations on the Office of Constable*.<sup>1</sup> Cross<sup>2</sup> says that he was encouraged by Fielding, though there is no evidence that Fielding actually helped him to write it. Fielding is affectionately mentioned several times, last in reference to the illness which caused him to go to Portugal for his health:

But if heaven spare a life, invaluable to his friends and family, hazarded, I may say with truth, sacrificed to the public welfare, I mean a magistrate, whose good heart, and great abilities, justly entitle him to the affection of every worthy mind; he will give you a perfect directory in your office, both of law and prudence. (p. 46)

The pamphlet is simple in style, perhaps with the constables in mind. Welch's inexperience as an author is shown in the apology which accompanies the errata. He had been unable to see the pamphlet through the press, and evidently no one did, since whole pages are out of order and at least one new error appears in the errata. The quotation I have just given is a fair example of Welch's style, which is more distinguished by earnestness and feeling than by urbanity. On the other hand, there is no evidence in this pamphlet, or in the earlier letter to Newcastle, of the 'swelling diction' mentioned in Boswell's recital of Reynolds's story of a visit to Welch's office during the examination of 'a little blackguard boy':

Welch, who imagined that he was exalting himself in Dr. Johnson's eyes by using big words, spoke in a manner that was utterly unintelligible to the boy; Dr. Johnson, perceiving it, addressed himself to the boy, and changed the pompous phraseology into colloquial language. Sir Joshua Reynolds, who was much amused by this procedure, which seemed a kind of reversing of what might have been expected from the two men, took notice of it to Dr. Johnson as they walked away by themselves. Johnson said, that it was continually the case; and that he was always obliged to *translate* the Justice's swelling diction, (smiling,) so as that

<sup>1</sup> Copies in the British Museum, Library of Congress, and Yale. Favourably reviewed and extensively quoted in the *Gentleman's Magazine* for March 1754 (xxiv. 144). The *Monthly Review* said: 'Mr. Welch very judiciously and honestly informs his brother constables what they *ought* to do, what they legally *may* do, and what they should *avoid*, in order to the right and useful discharge of their duty' (April 1754, x. 311–12).

<sup>2</sup> *Life of Fielding*, ii. 254.

his meaning might be understood by the vulgar from whom information was to be obtained.<sup>1</sup>

Allowing for Johnson's frequent exaggeration, Reynolds's keen sense of the dramatic, and Boswell's flair for journalism, we may perhaps conclude that Johnson on a few occasions (certainly not 'always') translated legal terms into common language, but one may reasonably guess that this was very early in Welch's twenty-one year career as a magistrate (say, 1755-58), for the very nature of this lowest court would soon force any magistrate to use intelligible terms. One may be permitted to doubt that Welch used these to exalt himself in Johnson's eyes, since this is mere inference by Reynolds (or Boswell). At any rate, in none of Welch's published writings, except where those were touched up by Johnson, is there any swelling diction.

That the little pamphlet for the constables served a need, may be judged from the fact that a reprint was later issued. I have not seen a copy.

In 1758 Welch published his most ambitious work, *A Proposal to render effectual a plan, to remove the nuisance of common prostitutes from the streets of this metropolis; to prevent the innocent from being seduced; to provide a decent and comfortable maintenance for those whom necessity or vice hath already forced into that infamous course of life; and to maintain and educate those children of the poor, who are either orphans, or are deserted by wicked parents. To which is annexed, A Letter upon the subject of robberies, wrote in the year 1753.*<sup>2</sup> In this pamphlet, I believe, Johnson assisted, though there is no external evidence available. The bulk of it consists of the proposals themselves, which are written in a direct, highly specific style, and even suggest rules and regulations to govern the proposed institution. The Dedication to Charles, Viscount Folkestone, president, and to the vice-presidents and members of the Society for Encouraging Arts and Manufactures,

<sup>1</sup> *Life of Johnson*, iv. 184.

<sup>2</sup> By Saunders Welch, one of His Majesty's Justices of the Peace for the County of Middlesex, and for the City and Liberty of Westminster. London: Printed for C. Henderson, at the Royal Exchange, and sold at the Booksellers and Pamphlet Shops of London and Westminster. 1758.

8vo. [2], B-14, K2. Title, verso blank. Dedication to Viscount Folkestone, &c., v. blank. Pp. 1-6 Introduction; Mr. Welch's Proposals, pp. 7-46; Letter [to the Duke of Newcastle], pp. 47-68. Copies: B.M., L.C.

Listed in the *Gentleman's Magazine* for May 1758 (xxviii. 233). Owen Ruffhead, in the *Monthly Review*, complimented the author's motives as he introduced three long quotations from the pamphlet: 'We congratulate the public upon the noble emulation which appears between Messrs. Welch and Fielding, for the disinterested service of their country. Our Readers are acquainted with many of their schemes and projects, and none as Mr. Welch observes, will doubt their *motives*, "who know either of them, or their views".' But the laborious editor of the *Statutes at Large* perhaps thought that there were too many laws already, and he concluded that he felt that if the J.P.s and subordinate officers faithfully did their duty 'the laws in being are sufficient to remedy most of the abuses intended to be removed by these Projectors' (xix. 89-91).

## DR. JOHNSON AND SAUNDERS WELCH'S PROPOSALS 341

is also direct, brief, and without any Johnsonian touches. But Welch, like so many of us, had some trouble beginning, and much more trouble ending, his work. It is in those places, general in subject and important in position, where we may find Johnson helping out. The Introduction occupies six pages, and but for two omissions I shall quote it all:

The publication of my thoughts upon the subject of providing for prostitutes, &c. which at present seems to ingross the attention of so many worthy minds, arises not from either a desire to distinguish myself, or the thirst of applause; much less is it done to depreciate the labours of others, who have published their sentiments upon the subject, particularly those two worthy gentlemen, Mr. Dingley, and Mr. Hanway: I know I shall not offend them by offering my mite towards this great and benevolent design. So far are these gentlemen from being tenacious of their own opinions, or arbitrarily enforcing any particular plan as the standard of perfection, that with a modesty inseparable from real merit, they desire that the sentiments of all who are inclined to write upon the subject, may be collected, as the best means of carrying their benevolent designs into execution; thereby preferring the public interest to the paltry consideration of being esteemed the projectors of a scheme. . . .

By this plan [i.e. that already published], bawdy-houses are left untouched; they may still seduce the Innocent, and continue their mischief to society with their usual impunity; nor is any provision made to remove the nuisance of common prostitutes from our streets; except such of them as shall voluntarily offer themselves to the intended hospital: what those will be, is easy to foresee: no doubt, many will offer, when their bodies are corrupted by diseases, and want and misery has surrounded them, and rendered them dreadful objects to warn others from treading in the same wicked paths. But after they are received into the hospital, are cured of their disease, clothed, and their health and spirits retrieved by comfortable nourishment, is it not in their option to continue, or to demand their discharge? and without the interposition of the legislature, a subject cannot be imprisoned in this, any more than in any other hospital: they may therefore return to their former lewd practices, and render the charity little other, than a Lock hospital for curing venereal distempers. . . .

It seems to me a mistake to assert, that the bawdy-houses and streets are furnished with prostitutes from the children of the laborious Poor: this, I believe, is not the case of one in twenty of these unhappy creatures. The wrong turn of education of the children of those in the next sphere of life to labourers, is the plentiful source from whence the bagnios and bawdy-houses are constantly supplied. And when disease and distemper render them incapable to see company (as it is termed) the streets receive them. The maxim of the parents of these children is, to give them what they call a good education; and if Miss happens to be pretty, her vanity is indulged by dress, &c. in hopes that she may mend her fortune by captivating some rich gudgeon, or be qualified to wait upon a lady, or at least to be a chamber-maid. The truth of this observation will sufficiently appear, from the great difficulty of getting servants for all work; and the vast number of candidates for higher stations.

Thus a useful education is sacrificed, and the fond deluded parent lays the foundation of the child's destruction in pride and idleness: Unused to do the meaner offices of life, and unable to get a station suitable to her education, pride united to necessity throws her as a mistress into the arms of the first man who is willing to support her in idleness and extravagance; or else she falls an easy prey to the artifices of bawds.

Others, who have the good luck to be placed in stations suitable to their education, are ruined by the false good-nature of their superiors; how often is the lady's woman seen flaunting in her mistress's left-off cloaths, and ridiculously affecting the airs of a woman of quality? Thus the mind is puffed up by vanity; that distinction and respectful distance which should always subsist, is weakened if not destroyed; and the giddy girl becomes much fitter to be the mistress of a man of quality, than a wife in her own station. This might be easily remedied, if persons of fashion, at the same time that they give their cloaths to their servants, would interdict their wearing them. As the case stands at present, the servant who applies for a place, resembles rather a visiter to the person she applies to, than one soliciting employment. Their finery induces them to insist upon high wages, to the great injury of all ranks of people who stand in need of their service; and instead of being of advantage to them, it involves them in difficulties from which they are unable to extricate themselves; for the whole of their wages being generally spent in cloaths, if by accident they are thrown out of place, what recourse have they for support, but first to pawn or sell their cloaths, and then to prostitute their persons?

The dread of the consequences to which the dissolute lives of prostitutes unavoidably subject them, namely, universal contempt, disease and want, may, indeed, have its influence over the minds of many, whose inclinations lead them to give a loose to their passions, or whose proneness to idleness tempts them to prefer a life of ease and debauchery, to that of industry and virtue. But, remove the dread of perishing in the streets by disease and want, and point out to them a certain *asylum* at all events, not attended with the certain punishment of confinement, labour or correction; and will not the loosely-inclined be induced to list themselves in the troops of prostitutes, under this reflection, that let what will happen, there is a certain retreat for them: and thus the hospital, instead of redressing the evil, will actually increase it.

The author's motive for publishing this imperfect essay, is a sincere desire to serve the Public, by removing these and other objections to this charity, in a manner agreeable to the genius of our laws. The truth of this declaration he believes none will question, who know either him or his views. To raise an honest fame by a faithful, active, and uncorrupt discharge of his trust, is the utmost of his ambition; and he modestly hopes, that in near thirteen years execution of his public offices, at the risque of his health, and hazard of his life, none can justly charge him with an arbitrary or corrupt action.

Now surely Johnson did not write all of this, or perhaps even much of it, but I think some Johnsonian phrases have already struck the reader's ear.

DR. J.  
I suggest  
to the  
(p. 1);  
society  
her van  
by cap  
offices  
united  
who i  
distinc  
if not  
of a n  
inclini  
to idle  
indus  
The  
level  
concr  
eviden  
to co  
intro  
TH  
Pre  
ho  
civ  
pre  
on  
it  
sh  
na  
(p  
The  
mon  
A  
is  
an  
to  
h  
a

I suggest these for special notice: 'thereby preferring the public interest to the paltry consideration of being esteemed the projectors of a scheme' (p. 1); 'they may still seduce the Innocent, and continue their mischief to society with their usual impunity' (p. 2); 'and if Miss happens to be pretty, her vanity is indulged by dress, &c. in hopes that she may mend her fortune by captivating some rich gudgeon' (p. 4); 'Unused to do the meanner offices of life, and unable to get a station suitable to her education, pride united to necessity throws her as a mistress into the arms of the first man who is willing to support her in idleness and extravagance' (p. 4); 'that distinction and respectful distance which should always subsist, is weakened if not destroyed; and the giddy girl becomes much fitter to be the mistress of a man of quality, than a wife in her own station' (p. 5); 'many, whose inclinations lead them to give a loose to their passions, or whose proneness to idleness tempts them to prefer a life of ease and debauchery, to that of industry and virtue' (pp. 5-6).

That Johnson wrote all of these, I shall not insist. But they are above the level of Welch's usual style, and in their parallelism, their force, and their concreteness, they are highly suggestive of Johnson. If there were no other evidence that Johnson had a hand in the pamphlet, we should be forced to conclude that some unknown friend had polished Welch's draft of his introduction.

The Proposals proper begin with two sentences equally suggestive:

Prostitutes swarm in the streets of this metropolis to such a degree, and bawdy-houses are kept in such an open and public manner, to the great scandal of our civil polity, that a stranger would think that such practices, instead of being prohibited, had the sanction of the legislature, and that the whole town was one general stew.

The complaint is as universal as the disorder; the consequences arising from it being sensibly felt by a general depravity of morals, a constant supply of sharpers and robbers to infest our streets, and a train of other evils, which naturally flow from minds depraved by lust and enervated by debauchery. . . . (pp. 7-8)

The last phrase is essentially Johnsonian, though the 'general depravity of morals' is not, since Johnson believed nothing of the sort.

A few pages farther on, two more sentences suggest Johnson again:

. . . Add to this, that the expence incurred by frequenting bawdy-houses, is too great for most people who connect themselves with whores and bawds; and yet when their fortunes are ruined by it, habit renders it extremely difficult to break this connexion: money must be had to support the extravagance; the highway, or the streets present themselves; whoring is succeeded by robbery; and these houses, as they are a certain nursery of robbers, are also the

concealers of them, and in them is riotously spent at night, what the violence of the day has procured. To suppress these houses by punishing the keepers, the law seemed to be framed with wisdom; but experience evinces that many things which appear demonstrable in theory, often fail in practice. . . . (pp. 13-14)

One should particularly note the elaborate metaphors in: 'the highway, or the streets present themselves; whoring is succeeded by robbery;' and the force of: 'in them is riotously spent at night, what the violence of the day has procured'.

But if I had had no more conclusive passage to quote, I should not have ventured to propose this pamphlet to serious Johnsonians as a work in which the Doctor had assisted. The last three paragraphs mark a sharp break in subject-matter. Welch has finished his specific proposals, and a general conclusion is in order. This I think Johnson wrote entire:

Thus have I endeavoured to model an institution, which by a due mixture of mildness and severity may redress an enormity which has long infested our streets, and disgraced our government; which has brought to the *grave* multitudes of the young by disease, and of the old by sorrow. I have laid down rules of an hospital, in which penitence may be sheltered, and corruption be reclaimed; where honest industry may be inculcated by instruction, or inforced by chastisement: where those who were once educated in the knowledge of religion, may gradually revive the principles which had been almost extinguished by intercourse with bad example, and by successive vicissitudes of riots and distress: and the light of instruction may be imparted to those, whose minds have been hitherto clouded with ignorance, whom poverty has resigned to guilt without a check, and whose intellectual powers have served them to no other purpose than those of fraud, and rapine, treachery and seduction.

From the reformation of guilt, if it can be happily effected, the prospect goes on to its prevention in succeeding generations. The unpleasing employment of punishing those who have already transgressed the laws of virtue, will be changed to that of preserving those who must hereafter transgress, if charity does not snatch them out of the snares of poverty. If there are any who hate vice more than they love virtue, and in their zeal for vindictive justice, consider all those as unworthy of their favour whose misery may be imputed to their crimes; yet not even those can refuse compassion to them who are about to suffer by the crimes of others; whom the poverty or negligence of their parents exposes to the temptation of hunger and nakedness; whom distress unavoidably mingles with robbers and profligates; and whose minds, untaught and unsettled, are open to the influence of every tongue which persuades them to relieve their wants at the expence of their innocence.

This charity is therefore recommended by every consideration, civil and religious: whoever contributes to it, may solace his mind by reflecting, that his charity frees the streets from annoyance, rescues his servants and children from temptation, secures his goods from robbery, and his life from violence;

DR. J.  
and,  
everla

This  
from a  
evident  
phrases  
vindict  
son's.

One  
to Bos  
the Ra  
have b  
to him  
marks  
to New  
the fac  
letter.

And  
cation  
about  
human  
of the  
sugge  
is not  
on the  
to his  
Of the  
it is a  
Johns  
operat  
to live  
and o  
the be  
agree  
Welch

and, what ought to prevail beyond all other motives, preserves souls from everlasting misery. (pp. 44-46)

This is the grand style, wholly different in its rhythm and incisiveness from anything previously written by Welch. The balance and parallelism evident in almost every sentence, and the Johnsonian hallmark in such phrases as 'successive vicissitudes of riots and distress' and 'their zeal for vindictive justice' could have come from no other pen in 1758 but Johnson's. It is a fine conclusion to Welch's proposals.

One may almost regret that Johnson did not acknowledge the assistance to Boswell, but it is at once clear why he did not do so. The association of the Rambler's name with a rather frank discussion of prostitution would have been a morsel which Boswell would have been quite unable to keep to himself, and he would have been inordinately delighted with some remarks about the practices of prostitutes which Welch made in the Letter to Newcastle appended to the work, remarks which perhaps account for the fact that two newspapers devoted seven columns apiece to printing the letter.

And now just what does this discussion add to our knowledge or appreciation of an obscure decade in Johnson's life? Principally, we learn more about one of Johnson's intimate friends. Welch emerges as a conscientious, humane constable and magistrate, deeply concerned about a large variety of the social problems of his time, eager to apply practical remedies (his suggestion that youthful offenders be separated from hardened criminals is not yet universally observed), unwilling to visit the sins of the parents on their children—a man moral and religious in nature and kindly disposed to his fellows in spite of an official life which might have hardened him. Of the same age as Johnson, he was not far from him in temperament, and it is agreeable to remember that when Welch became seriously ill in 1776 Johnson partly repaid him for the winter in which Welch showed him the operation of a magistrate's court by securing for his friend leave of absence to live in Italy with his family. Welch died in the same year as Johnson, and one of his daughters married Nollekens, who executed the best and the best-known portrait bust of Johnson. It is a pleasant story, and it is agreeable to add at this late date another instance of their friendship in Welch's *Proposals*.

## MATTHEW ARNOLD AND T. H. HUXLEY: SOME NEW LETTERS 1870-80

By W. H. G. ARMYTAGE

FROM 1869, when Arnold was forty-seven years old, an active and increasing preoccupation with religion seems to characterize his subsequent writings. 'The noiseless current strong, obscure, and deep' began to carry his thought to conclusions which seemed dangerously heretical. So it is not without significance that at this very time a close and intimate friendship seems to have been developed between himself and T. H. Huxley, then the foremost protagonist of the scientific school.

We know that Huxley invited Arnold to dine with him at the Geological Society's dinner on 21 February 1868, and again on 19 February 1869.<sup>1</sup> They also met at the hospitable table of Lady Lubbock.<sup>2</sup> But perhaps their chief meeting-ground was the Athenaeum, 'a place at which', Arnold confessed, 'I enjoy something approaching beatitude'.<sup>3</sup> They must have left the club together deep in conversation one day in July 1869, for we find Huxley writing on the 8th of that month;

My dear Arnold,

Look at Bishop Wilson on the sin of covetousness and then inspect your own umbrella stand. You will there see a beautiful brown smooth-handled umbrella which is not yours.

Think of what the excellent prelate would have advised and bring it with you next time you come to the club.<sup>4</sup>

Yet perhaps even more significant still was the fact that the Arnolds entertained the Huxleys with the very last dinner party given at 2 Chester Square before they moved to Harrow.<sup>5</sup>

The general trend of their conversations on these occasions can perhaps be further surmised from a letter which Arnold wrote to Huxley in the following year, a month before his *St. Paul and Protestantism* appeared:

Saffron Walden  
May 10 [1870]

My dear Huxley,

I have told Smith<sup>6</sup> to send you a copy of St. Paul to the Athanaeum. I am

<sup>1</sup> Letters of Matthew Arnold, ed. G. W. E. Russell (London, 1901), i. 451; ii. 3.

<sup>2</sup> Wife of Sir John Lubbock (1834-1913), the banker and scientist, who was an authority on ants.

<sup>3</sup> E. K. Chambers, Matthew Arnold (Oxford, 1947), 130; Russell, ed. cit. i. 58-59.

<sup>4</sup> Life and Letters of T. H. Huxley, ed. L. Huxley (London, 1900), ii. 448.

<sup>5</sup> Russell, ed. cit. i. 453.

<sup>6</sup> George Smith (1824-1901) owner and publisher of the Cornhill Magazine (since 1859) and the Pall Mall Gazette (since 1865) for which Arnold wrote. He also published Arnold's books.

driven up and down inspecting, so I cannot see you as I wished, to tell you to begin with *St. Paul and Protestantism*, and to read the Introduction and Preface afterwards. These touch historical and ecclesiastical questions which the treatise on St. Paul raised, and on which the Puritans feel strongly, but which will have no special interest for you.

Conversance almost daily for now almost twenty years with these singular but powerful people the Protestant Dissenters,—and the experience how they imagined themselves in possession of an instrument called *the gospel*, which enabled them to regard de haut en bas poetry, philosophy, science, and spiritual effort of all kinds other than the gospel, to judge it and to do without it,—drove me at length to try and show them that *the gospel* itself was not what they imagined, or as they imagined, but that it followed the same lines as other spiritual productions, was a thing growing naturally and with many parts which must fall away from it or be transformed, and not to be comprehended rightly so long as it is isolated as they isolate it. This design is to be borne in mind in reading what I have written.

I have been reading your Descartes lecture with so much sympathy that I am impelled to do what I can to make you see what I meant and wished in this book I send you

Ever sincerely yours,  
Matthew Arnold.<sup>1</sup>

Huxley acknowledged that from the book he had picked up 'many good things' of which 'one of the best is what you say near the end about science gradually conquering the materialism of popular religion'. He compared his own work among his scientific friends with that of Arnold among the Puritans, with the difference that whereas Arnold cited St. Paul, he cited Nature. But, added Huxley slyly, 'I have my doubts if Paul would own you, if he could return to expand his own epistles.'<sup>2</sup>

In November 1870 Matthew Arnold went to hear T. H. Huxley lecture at South Kensington on physical science,<sup>3</sup> and it is to some weeks after this that the next letter must be assigned.

Athenaeum  
Saturday [1870]

My dear Huxley,

I am greatly dis'appointed' not to meet you at Shuttleworth's last night. Dr. Sarazin<sup>4</sup> purposes to translate your Lay Sermons. I will answer for his entirely competent knowledge of English, and I suppose you would be glad to have the

<sup>1</sup> This, and the following letters, are printed by kind permission of the Governing Body of the Imperial College of Science and Technology, Prince Consort Road, South Kensington, where Huxley's papers are housed.

<sup>2</sup> L. Huxley, ed. cit. ii. 11.

<sup>3</sup> G. W. E. Russell, ed. cit. ii. 49.

<sup>4</sup> A French army surgeon who translated Arnold's *Literature and Dogma*, whose letters Arnold valued.

book well turned into French. He wants to be authorized by you, and if you agree, will you send him the book.

Dr. Sarazin  
Médecin Major,  
Amélie les Bains  
Pyrénées Orientales.

I thought you had migrated to Edinburgh with your family for some months, but I now find you left your family here and larked off by yourself. Alas, how often in observing you men of science, have I to sigh with Manfred:

The tree of knowledge is not that of life!

ever yours,  
Matthew Arnold.

Huxley was elected a member of the London School Board, established as a result of W. E. Forster's Education Act of 1870. In the same year he was also appointed a member of the Royal Commission on Scientific Instruction and the Advancement of Science. So it is not surprising that Arnold's next letter should read:

Harrow  
Nov<sup>ber</sup> 9th 1871.

My dear Huxley,

I found from Longman, who no longer publishes for me, that he had 30 or 40 copies left of my account of schools in France, Holland and French Switzerland, and I have told him to send you one of them, because the book contains two things, the French law (Guizot's) and the Dutch law, which are not easily got elsewhere. I write this to save you from having to write a letter of acknowledgement—you are not to thank me for them till you see me.

Ever yours sincerely,  
Matthew Arnold.

In view of the fact that Huxley is generally credited with being one of the architects of the London School Board system, this letter is not without interest.

The work which such public service, coupled with his lecturing and examining at South Kensington, involved; the recurrence of his old digestive ailments, and the strain of sustaining a heavy programme of writing, led Huxley to resign from the school board. Arnold's next letter was therefore addressed to Huxley's wife and read:

Harrow  
Jan<sup>y</sup>. 13 1872

My dear Mrs Huxley,

I have been away in the North, and there I heard from Mr. Forster that your husband was ordered abroad by the doctors; and on my return I find him gone. I am greatly disappointed not to have seen him before he went, to tell him how often I shall think of him and what cordial wishes I forward for his entire restora-

tion to full health and spirits: there are few indeed among those with whom I have become acquainted in these later and colder years of life for whom I feel, and have felt from almost the first meeting with him, such affectionate liking and regard. It must be dismal for you and the children to be left, but I am sure the right thing for him was to go. It is some weeks since I have seen him, but even when I saw him last I was sure he needed change and rest; and since then he has had an attack about which I should have written to him, only when I was told of it I was told at the same time that he was recovering and would be about again in a day or two. So I hoped to meet him at the Club as usual—and now he is gone without my having either written to him or seen him.

Say everything that is kind to him from me when you write, and believe me always, my dear Mrs. Huxley,

sincerely yours,

Matthew Arnold.

I hope the children are now all quite well. Some day in the course of the next few weeks I shall try and pay you a visit. Mrs. Arnold sends her kindest regards.

Throughout that year Arnold's religious interests deepened. *A Bible Reading for Schools: The Great Prophecy of Israel's Restoration* was followed by an article on Ernest Renan for *Every Saturday*, and a continuation of the argument developed in *St. Paul and Protestantism* for the *Cornhill*. This, under the title *Literature and Dogma*, was published in book form by February 1873. In that same month, Arnold wrote once more to Huxley, predicting a religious revolution as great as the Reformation:

Harrow

Feb<sup>y</sup> 13th 1873

My dear Huxley,

I must scratch one line of thanks to you for your letter, before I depart. It is always pleasant to me to feel myself in sympathy with you, for a strong ground of sympathy there is between us, I am sure, at bottom. Stanley had picked out 'the three Lord Shaftesburys' as dangerous and regrettable, and I shall be sorry to have said anything which enables the enemy to divert attention from his damaged position by raising a cry of *scoffing* and *scandal*. What you say about a 'paper fetish' is excellent. I think, however, we shall see in our time a change in religion as great as that which happened at the Reformation, and, like that, a decided advance on the whole: though like that, by the mere fact of it being a popular movement and embracing numbers of men, it will carry with it a large part of blunder and misconception. But still it will be an advance both on mediaeval Catholicism and on the Reformation; and it is in this slow way that progress is made.

Manage your health prudently, and let me find you in your old full force and spirits at my return in June. Few things would give me more cordial pleasure.

Kindest regards from both Mrs. Arnold and me to Mrs. Huxley.

Always yours most sincerely,

Matthew Arnold.

A month later, Huxley was consoling Arnold, who had lost his son Trevenen William. In October, Arnold was reminding Huxley 'we dine at 7 not  $\frac{1}{2}$  past, in order to give you more time before you return'. Huxley was evidently drawn closer in this, the year of Arnold's bereavement.

Criticisms of *Literature and Dogma* kept Arnold busy in 1874<sup>1</sup> and up to late in 1875 he was replying in the *Contemporary Review*, his articles being republished at the end of the latter year as a book entitled *God and the Bible*. Just after it had appeared, Huxley wrote to him, and Arnold replied:

Wesleyan Training College,  
Westminster S.W.

Dec<sup>ber</sup> 8th 1875.

My dear Huxley,

Your letter gave me very great pleasure.<sup>2</sup> First, because it put the saddle on the right horse, and made me indebted to Spinoza and not to the Germans. It makes me rather angry to be affiliated to German Biblical critics; I have had to read masses of them, and they would have drowned me if it had not been for the corks I had brought from the study of Spinoza. To him I owe more than I can say.

Secondly, it gave me strong pleasure to find you so fully owning the charm and salutariness of J. C. They are unquestionable, and it is kicking against the pricks to deny them, or to quarrel with men for running after them. It is like denying that Lincoln Minster is grand, or wanting to pull it down, because the Bishop of Lincoln is an aggravating old woman. The faults of Christianity come from its immense popularity, and from good and bad, fit and unfit, having been impelled to have dealings with it; they will be cured, and their promoters baffled, by pointing out the true virtue of J. C., not by saying he has no virtue at all.

You never appear at the Athenaeum now. My life is very hellish (Goethe) as I have two lectures on Butler to give at Edinburgh in January, and no leisure to get them ready.

Yours ever sincerely,  
Matthew Arnold.

These lectures, together with other essays, Arnold collected together and published as *Last Essays on Church and Religion* in 1877. When, after three months, they had appeared, he wrote to Huxley:

Athenaeum Club.  
March 28 [1877]

My dear Huxley,

I have sent you a volume of my last essays; and there are few people to whom I send my things with so much pleasure, though I know you cannot always agree with me.

<sup>1</sup> Not too busy, however, for he transcribed a passage from Huxley's article 'On the Hypothesis that Animals are Automata, and its History', which appeared in the *Fortnightly Review*, 1 Nov. 1874. See *The Notebooks of Matthew Arnold*, ed. H. F. Lowry, K. Young, and W. H. Dunn (Oxford, 1952), p. 220.

<sup>2</sup> He sent it to his sister, with explicit instructions for its return. Russell, ed. cit. ii. 143.

But will you do this for me? Just look at the remarks on Butler's argument for a future state (p. 125), where biology in some sort comes in, and tell me, at your leisure, if there is anything amiss in what I have said. I don't think I have gone off the plainest of plain ground, where even an ignorant layman may walk safely; but I am always a little uneasy in these cases until I am reassured by an expert.

The account of the trial of the Lowestoft witches before Hale, which I think will interest you, is in the first essay.

I wish we could have dined with you when Mrs. Huxley asked us!

Ever yours

Matthew Arnold.

After Saturday we are established at Cobham again.

In December he and Huxley met Gladstone at a dinner party, and 'talked to him a little about Ireland', but the correspondence seems to fall off, at least on Arnold's side. Perhaps it was due to the fact that now he had written his last religious *Essays*, he no longer required a whetstone. Yet there were other services Huxley could render as the next letter shows:

Athenaeum

Nov<sup>ber</sup> 22nd [1878]

My dear Huxley,

Be a kind soul and give your advice to a poor shiftless man of letters who has fortified himself by no agreements. Look at the enclosed from Craik; Macmillan advanced me £100, and two books, Johnson's Lives and my Selected Poems, are to provide payment for it. The Johnson was published at Michaelmas, 1,500 copies, publishing price 6/-, trade price 4/6; 600 copies are sold and the edition is sure to sell out as the Civil Service Commissioners have put the book in their list of books recommended to examiners in English Literature. The Selected Poems was published at Whitsuntide, 500 copies, publishing price 4/6, trade price 3/5; the edition was exhausted in Oct<sup>ber</sup> and a new one (1500) has just come out.

The question is, whether £25 is a fair price to offer for the edition of Johnson's Lives, and whether £25 is a fair price to offer (sixpence a copy) for 2200 copies of the Selected Poems.

I know you deal with Macmillan on this 'Royalty' plan, and therefore you will be the better able to judge whether the price offered for the Poems, especially, is a fair one.

You will notice what Craik says of their selling them *below* trade price, but surely, if they choose to do this, I ought not to suffer for it.

I hate fighting, and I have long acquiesced in being a little read author, who might be satisfied if he got his things published free of expense to him, and with some little profit. But my things are selling much better now, and the comfort of my old age, and my being able to retire on my pension at 60, greatly depends on my getting a fair price for my publications.

How I wish I saw you here sometimes—or indeed saw you anywhere!  
Do not hate me for giving you this trouble; a short answer will probably suffice;  
I shall not write to Craik till I hear from you. Write to Cobham, Surrey.

Yours ever sincerely,  
Matthew Arnold.

Arnold's interest in politics, education, and social philosophy was rekindling in these latter years: 'I think I am gradually making an impression about public secondary schools', he told Mrs. Forster on 16 January 1879. To another sister he wrote: 'Maine and Lecky both said to me . . . that the work I was doing by forcing the question of middle-class education and civilisation upon people's thoughts was invaluable, and that they were heartily with me.' One of the people upon whose thoughts Matthew Arnold was happy to have made some impression was the Vice-President of the Council, A. J. Mundella, who 'asked him a great deal about the policy which the office should follow'.<sup>1</sup> They met while taking holidays in Pontresina, and on Arnold's return, he found that Huxley's *Science and Education*<sup>2</sup> was waiting for him. He replied:

Cobham, Surrey.  
xxist Sunday after Trinity 1880.  
[17 Oct.]

My dear Huxley,

Many thanks for your Discourse, which was delivered when I was abroad and only rumours of it had reached me; I was very glad to read it, and very good reading it is, as your deliverances always are.

What you say of me is abundantly kind, and God forbid that I should make such a bad return as to enter into controversy with you: but I will remark that the dictum about knowing 'the best that has been known and said in the world' was meant to include knowing what has been said in science and art as well as letters. I remembered changing the word *said* to the word *uttered*, because I was dissatisfied with the formula for seeming not to include art, and a picture or a statue may be called an *utterance* though it cannot be called a *saying*: however I went back to *said* for the base reason that the formula runs so much easier off the tongue with the shorter word. But I never doubted that the formula included science.

In the holidays I read your Hume carefully through for the first time. It is excellent; but I wish you had made the thread of a biography extend through the whole, and said your say about his philosophy in connection with the mention of his various publications as they followed one another. I think the book would have become a better one still, but it is excellent as it is.

I have plenty to make me melancholy—public affairs, the approach of old age,

<sup>1</sup> Russell, ed. cit. 177, 178, and 203.

<sup>2</sup> Printed in Huxley's *Collected Essays* (London, 1893), iii. 134.

the general cussedness of mankind—but your goodwill and sympathy act always as a cordial.

Ever sincerely yours  
Matthew Arnold.

The eleventh and last letter in the collection cannot be placed. Dated 9 February from the Athenaeum, it runs:

My dear Huxley,

It is some comfort to have your book as I never meet you. I will make a hostile criticism of the book: it ought to be in 8vo. It is too fresh, too terse, too readable, too made to be carried around in one's hand and enjoyed constantly.<sup>1</sup>

Tell Mrs. Huxley, with the compliments of the hermit of the mole, that her verses are very good.

Ever yours, in spite of old age, poverty, low spirits and solitude.

Matthew Arnold.

'A capital speaker' Arnold once called Huxley,<sup>2</sup> and these letters show that the feeling was deeper: 'There are few indeed among those with whom I have become acquainted in these later and colder years of life for whom I feel, and have felt from almost the first meeting with him, such affectionate liking and regard.' Both men became classics in the same generation, each one regarded as an opposite pole to the other. Yet between those poles there flowed a current of feeling at once so warm and mutually sympathetic, that their respective output was charged and alive to all the intellectual disturbances of their age.

<sup>1</sup> It is hard to discover which particular work of Huxley's this was. Of the folio volumes he issued, all were specifically connected with osteology and practical biology, with copious illustrations. The most likely hypothesis is that Arnold was referring to some privately printed collection of Huxley's sayings. Such a collection was certainly published after Huxley's death by his widow, and the hypothesis gains support from the next paragraph of Arnold's letter referring to Mrs. Huxley's poetry, which was not actually published until 1913. In this, Huxley was represented by three poems, two of which were written after Arnold's death.

<sup>2</sup> Russell, ed. cit. ii. 3.

## NOTES AND OBSERVATIONS

### THE BENEDICTINE OFFICE AND THE METRICAL PARAPHRASE OF THE LORD'S PRAYER IN MS. C.C.C.C. 201

THE accepted text of the so-called *Benedictine Office*<sup>1</sup> is taken from MS. Junius 121, and contains OE. prose introductions to the several Hours, together with metrical paraphrases of the Lord's Prayer, the Creed and the Gloria, and metrical renderings of a number of Psalm-verses. Parts of the text (viz. the prose introductions and the paraphrase of the Gloria) survive also in MS. 201 in the library of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, and the versions in this manuscript do not differ significantly from those in MS. Junius 121. There is, however, in the Cambridge MS. another OE. metrical paraphrase of the Lord's Prayer,<sup>2</sup> giving an entirely different version from that in MS. Junius 121, and seemingly unconnected with the *Benedictine Office*.<sup>3</sup>

While preparing a new edition of the *Benedictine Office* I became convinced that there is, in fact, a connexion between this text as a whole and *Lord's Prayer II*. Lines 64–65 of the latter read:

þu geæfelodest þe ealle gesceafta,  
and tosyndrodest hig siððan on manega.

In the *Benedictine Office*, ll. 20–23 of the *Gloria*<sup>4</sup> are:

þu settest on foldan swyðe feala cynna  
and tosyndrodost hig syððon on mængeo;  
þu gewrohtest, ece God, ealle gesceafta  
on syx dagum. . . .<sup>5</sup>

This correspondence can hardly be accidental. It is probable that the significant words belong originally to the *Gloria* as they occur naturally in the

<sup>1</sup> Ed. E. Feiler, *Das Benediktiner-Offizium, ein altenglisches Brevier aus dem 11 Jahrhundert: ein Beitrag zur Wulfstanfrage* (*Anglistische Forschungen*, iv; Heidelberg, 1901).

<sup>2</sup> Ed. Grein-Wülcker, *Bibliothek der angelsächsischen Poesie*, II. ii (Leipzig, 1894), 230–8, and E. V. K. Dobbie, *The Anglo-Saxon Minor Poems* (*The Anglo-Saxon Poetic Records*, vi; London and New York, 1942), pp. 70–74.

<sup>3</sup> To facilitate reference, I shall use the terminology of the editors of the *Anglo-Saxon Poetic Records* series (see Dobbie, op. cit., p. lxxiii). The version in MS. Junius 121 is *Lord's Prayer III*, and that in MS. C.C.C.C. 201, *Lord's Prayer II*.

<sup>4</sup> Grein-Wülcker, II. ii. 239–44, and Dobbie, 74–77.

<sup>5</sup> This is the version in MS. Junius 121. In the *Gloria* in MS. C.C.C.C. 201 the spelling of l. 21 agrees with that of the corresponding line in *Lord's Prayer II*. The appearance of the same line in both poems is noted in Grein-Wülcker (II. ii. 241, note to l. 21), but not in Dobbie.

context of 'Sicut erat in principio'. In *Lord's Prayer II* they occur in the section headed by 'Et in terra'.

It appears, moreover, that the scribes of MS. C.C.C.C. 201 were aware of a connexion between *Lord's Prayer II* and *Gloria*. In this manuscript<sup>1</sup> the prose parts of the *Benedictine Office*, all in the same hand, appear together on pp. 112–14. On p. 161 there begins a series of poems<sup>2</sup> called *Be Domes Dæge, Lar, Oratio Poetica, Lord's Prayer II*, and *Gloria*, the last concluding on p. 170. The last two are in the same hand (not that of the other poems), and this hand is similar to, and perhaps identical with, that of the prose parts. Further, the conclusion of *Lord's Prayer II* is followed in the same line by the letters *la* (i.e. 'Gloria', with the initial *G* omitted) and on the next line of the manuscript the *Gloria* begins without indication of a break, other than a capital letter in the first word.

The relation of *Lord's Prayer II* to the *Benedictine Office* leads us to compare the two metrical paraphrases of the Lord's Prayer thus brought together. E. V. K. Dobbie<sup>3</sup> argues against a similarity of origin:

... that the *Lord's Prayer II* and the *Lord's Prayer III* were from the beginning two separate translations is shown not only by the difference in length, but also by definite criteria of subject matter and style. The poet of the *Lord's Prayer II*, for example, not only asserts the identity of the Father and the Son (l. 42b), but in several places (*swa bin fæder worhte*, l. 40; *pines fæder rice*, l. 72; and apparently also in l. 42, where the emendation to *sire* seems unavoidable) he makes the poem a prayer to the Son as well as to the Father, without regard for its dominical origin.

The difference in length is considerable,<sup>4</sup> but both poems consist essentially of translations of the individual clauses of the prayer, filled out by the addition of exegetic material, more copiously so in *Lord's Prayer II* than in *Lord's Prayer III*. As for the other alleged criteria, cf. *Lord's Prayer III*, ll. 3–5:<sup>5</sup>

Sanctificetur nomen tuum:

þæt sy gehalgod, hygcreftum fast,  
þin nama nu ða, neriente Crist,  
in urum ferhblocan feste gestaðelod.

and l. 18:

þæt is se clæna Crist, drihten God.

<sup>1</sup> On which see M. R. James, *A Descriptive Catalogue of the Manuscripts in the Library of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge*, i (Cambridge, 1912), 485–91.

<sup>2</sup> *Be Domes Dæge*, ed. J. R. Lumby, E.E.T.S. lxv (1876). The nomenclature of the first three poems is Lumby's.

<sup>3</sup> Op. cit., p. lxxiv.

<sup>4</sup> *Lord's Prayer II* contains 123 lines of OE.; *Lord's Prayer III*, 37.

<sup>5</sup> Grein-Wülcker, II. ii. 228–30, and Dobbie, 77–78. The Latin is not included in the traditional line-numbering.

also ll. 27-29:

Et ne nos inducas in temptationem:  
 Ne læd þu us to wite in wean sorge  
 ne in costunge, Crist nerigende,  
 þy læs we . . .

These passages imply the identity of the Son and the Father; there is no more regard for the circumstances of the origin of the Prayer in this version than there is in the other.

It seems necessary to conclude that *Lord's Prayer II* is an alternative version to *Lord's Prayer III*, not demonstrably by a different author, nor written with a different purpose, and that both belong equally to the *Benedictine Office*.

JAMES M. URE

THE PUNCTUATION OF *MACBETH*, I. i. 1-2

It is disquieting that we should not be sure how to punctuate the most famous opening lines in Shakespeare, and we must be grateful to Professor Dover Wilson for joining issue with Professor Kenneth Muir's Arden edition.<sup>1</sup> Are we to punctuate with the Folio, and Professors Muir, Alexander, and Harrison (*Penguin Shakespeare*)?—

When shall we three meet again?  
 In thunder, lightning, or in rain?

or with most editors since Hanmer?—

When shall we three meet again  
 In thunder, lightning, or in rain?

I differ from both Professor Muir and Professor Wilson in that I find it very difficult to come to a decision, and as I do not think the arguments on both sides have been set forth in any one place, even an airing of uncertainties may have its uses.

On the question of the authority of the Folio punctuation, I am much more in agreement with Professor Wilson than with Professor Muir (let alone Dr. Flatter). To retain the Folio punctuation on 'conservative' principles (i.e. against one's own better judgement) would be absurd in a text which must be so far from the author's manuscript. It is the actual merits of the two punctuations—their merits as attempts to render what Shake-

<sup>1</sup> R.E.S., n.s. iii (1952), 72-73.

speare meant—that seem to me almost equally balanced. Hanmer's emendation would seem to have logic on its side, and logic is always worth hearing, even if eighteenth-century editors sometimes applied it inappropriately. The question, it is argued, is not under what conditions the witches will meet again—it is assumed that it will be in conditions of storm—but only, *when* they will meet. That is the question the second witch answers in ll. 3–4, and her single (though bipartite) answer presupposes a single question, not two. At first sight this seems conclusive, yet doubts persist. In the first place, Professor Wilson and most of his predecessors are not such unbending logicians as Hanmer, who read 'and in rain' in l. 2. But will logic be satisfied with less? What exactly does the compromise text, accepting Hanmer's punctuation but retaining *or*, mean?<sup>1</sup> By an effort we might arrive at the paraphrase (to put it in the language of the examination question): '*either* in thunder and lightning *or* in rain *or* in both'. But at any rate *or* spoils the neatness of the logic. If Shakespeare has in fact disjoined thunder, lightning, and rain instead of conjoining them, the way is open to supposing that he was not aiming at the sort of clear-cut sense Hanmer looks for. If that is so, may there not be an uneasy loose end—two questions asked, only one answered, and the unanswered question implying an unnatural separation of what belongs together? This sort of interpretation of l. 2, all the more valuable because the textual problem does not seem to have been in the critic's mind, is to be found in L. C. Knights's *Explorations*, p. 18: 'the second line suggests a region where the elements are disintegrated as they never are in nature; thunder and lightning are disjoined, and offered as alternatives'. Even if one is suspicious of some attempts to see the single phrase as the microcosm of the play, there is something suggestive about the asymmetry and conflict of this line.

My other difficulty about Hanmer's punctuation is a theatrical one. The witches must surely employ a measured chant, with heavy pauses. The second witch's answer, even if it is logically single, is divided into two parallel phrases. Rhythmical balance, then, quite as important as logic, is much better satisfied by the Folio punctuation than by Hanmer's, and indeed I doubt whether the lines could be naturally delivered on the stage in such a way as to make clear that there was no pause in sense after *again*. How have the lines in fact imprinted themselves on the popular memory? Until recently, very few people since the eighteenth century who were not professional scholars can ever have seen in print the Folio punctuation—yet how familiar as a quotation is 'When shall we three meet again?'; and how seldom can those who quote it have thought of it as less than complete in

<sup>1</sup> Professor Wilson points out to me that Onions, *Shakespeare Glossary*, quotes two passages for *or* 'loosely used where no alternative is in question'. But this alleged usage finds no support in *O.E.D.*, and in both passages a disjunction seems to me detectable.

itself. Hanmer's logic has convinced editors; has it ever really won over the public?

But not even Dr. Johnson would have regarded the common reader as the final arbiter on matters of textual criticism, and I do not press this last point. Certainly there is still force in Hanmer's common-sense demand that question and answer should correspond, and Professor Muir brushes it aside too easily. But have not Professor Wilson and his predecessors admitted the thin end of the non-logical wedge by retaining *or* for *and*, and can the not-quite-perfect logic of this compromise reading be defended? Should we even take our courage in both hands and read *and*? I do not know, but the whole question seems to me almost as well worth raising as that of the punctuation of Hamlet's 'What a piece<sup>1</sup> of work is a man' speech, over which two of the scholars who are ranged against each other on this passage as well have battled so gallantly, to the enlightenment of the rest of us.

J. C. MAXWELL

#### A WORD IN SHIRLEY'S *THE CARDINAL*

THE Cardinal, in Act IV, Scene ii, of Shirley's play of that name, tries to convince the Duchess that Columbo has been rightly pardoned by the King for the murder of Alvarez. She replies:

Good my lord,  
Your phrase has too much landscape, and I cannot  
Distinguish, at this distance you present,  
The figure perfect.

The use of 'landscape' in this protest seems to fit in with a sense (now obsolete) which the *O.E.D.* defines as 'the background of scenery in a portrait or figure painting'. The Cardinal has surrounded his argument ('the figure') with so much extraneous matter ('landscape') that it is obscured. If this interpretation is correct then Shirley's use of the word (in 1641) antedates the examples quoted by the *O.E.D.* for 1656 and 1676, and is a rather clearer use of the word in this sense than those given in the examples.

There is one difficulty, however, in fixing on this meaning to interpret Shirley's lines, and that is in the phrase 'at this distance you present'. The

<sup>1</sup> A parenthetical question: is it certain, as all editors have assumed, that Q2's 'What peece' is a mere misprint? It could be defended by several examples cited by W. Franz, *Die Sprache Shakespeares* (Halle, 1939), p. 245, notably *Two Gent.* i. ii. 53: 'What 'foole is she', where the Folio's apostrophe neatly illustrates the obsolescence of the construction: it is reasonable to suppose that it originated in Crane's transcript, which is usually thought to have been the copy for the Folio in this play.

*O.E.D.* notes (4. b) another obsolete sense, 'a distant prospect; a vista', which first occurs in 1599, and among the supporting quotations is this from Overbury's character of a Whore: 'The sins of other women shew in Landscip, far off and full of shadow; hers in Statue, neere hand, and bigger in the life.'

Both ideas would seem to be included in Shirley's lines, therefore. 'Your argument is nearly all distance. Where is the figure which it should throw into relief?' At the same time it is possible that the sense of 'background' rather than 'vista' is present in Overbury's words. 'Beside hers, other women's sins are passed over unnoticed, like the landscape background to a portrait. In fact, the Whore's sins are so monstrous that they cannot even be compared with the figure that stands out against a landscape background. Rather, they strike the sense with the unimpeded impact of a statue which has no background to distract the beholder.'

That there should be ambiguity in the use of the word 'landscape' at this period is not surprising. Possibly no other word introduced as a technical term into English from a foreign language proliferated so rapidly into secondary meanings and metaphorical uses. It is unnecessary to illustrate this; the evidence lies in the entry in the *O.E.D.* What this examination of Shirley's lines suggests, however, is that the dating of the sense of 'background of scenery in a portrait or figure painting' needs amendment to 1641, if not to 1613 (? 1616), the date of Overbury's work.

D. S. BLAND

### POPE'S 'DUCHESSES AND LADY MARY'S'

ACCORDING to Professor James Sutherland one of the 'purely private references which Pope occasionally allowed himself, in order to gratify some pique',<sup>1</sup> is contained in this passage from Book Two of the *Dunciad* (ll. 123-32):

To him the Goddess. 'Son! thy grief lay down,  
And turn this whole illusion on the town.  
As the sage dame, experienc'd in her trade,  
By names of Toasts retails each batter'd jade,  
(Whence hapless Monsieur much complains at Paris  
Of wrongs from Duchesses and Lady Mary's)  
Be thine, my stationer! this magic gift;  
Cook shall be Prior, and Concanen, Swift;  
So shall each hostile name become our own,  
And we too boast our Garth and Addison.'

<sup>1</sup> See The Twickenham Edition of the *Dunciad* (London, 1943), p. 112, note to lines 127-8.

Few of Pope's readers, Mr. Sutherland says, 'could have understood what was meant' by the couplet which refers to 'hapless Monsieur' and to 'Duchesses and Lady Mary's'. In his note on the couplet Mr. Sutherland then proceeds to identify the 'hapless Monsieur' with M. Rémond, the 'wretched Monsieur' of *Sober Advice from Horace*, l. 53, and to recall the Frenchman's 'financial and personal relations with Lady Mary Wortley Montagu'.<sup>1</sup> The allusion in 'Duchesses', he says, remains unexplained.

In two of the 1735 editions of the *Dunciad* Pope provided, as Mr. Sutherland notes, the following annotation to the couplet:

This passage was thought to allude to a famous Lady who cheated a French wit of 5000 pounds in the South-Sea year. But the Author meant it in general of all bragging Travellers, and of all Whores and Cheats under the name of Ladies.

The first statement in Pope's annotation certainly relates to what is known or suspected about M. Rémond's adventures with Lady Mary. It is Pope's second statement (where the poet suggests that the aim of his satire is general as well as personal) which has not been given the attention it deserves. This is in accord with the well-established tendency to distrust the accuracy of anything Pope had to say about himself or his art.

There is evidence in this case, however, to support the truth of Pope's second statement about his couplet. The lines do not have the 'purely private' reference supposed by Mr. Sutherland; the meaning of the lines, at least part of the meaning, must have been, on the contrary, quite 'public' in the poet's time, although the thrust at Lady Mary undoubtedly satisfied simultaneously an element of personal pique. The entire passage is cleared up, in fact, by the following extract from an anonymous work entitled *A View of London and Westminster: or, The Town Spy . . . By a German Gentleman* (London, 1725):

Here [in an area near Drury Lane] all our Ladies of Quality of tolerable Beauty, and our celebrated Toasts, &c. are represented by Proxy [*i.e.*, the names and titles of such ladies had been adopted by prostitutes] without their Knowledge, from the Ortelian *Dutchess*, even down to the famous black *Toy-Woman* in the City. I heard of a Frenchman once boasting in a publick Company at *Paris*, of the Favours he had receiv'd from a certain *English Countess* in *la Rue Drury Ville Londres* [sic], when the Lady's Brother chanc'd to be present, so that Monsieur met with a Just Chastisement for his Ignorance and Impertinence.<sup>2</sup>

*A View of London and Westminster* was published three years before the first edition of the *Dunciad*, and therefore any supposition that the situation described in it stems from Pope's verses must be ruled out. The poet's statement, then, that he meant the couplet to refer to 'all bragging Travellers'

<sup>1</sup> See The Twickenham Edition of the *Dunciad* (London, 1943), p. 112, note to lines 127-8.

<sup>2</sup> pp. 14-15.

and to 'all Whores and Cheats under the name of Ladies' appears to have some basis in fact; the lines would have suggested to his readers a rather common form of female deception practiced in the brothels near Drury Lane. In the allusion to 'Duchesses' the poet need not have had any particular person in mind, for as the anonymous author describes the situation the word 'Duchesses' merely suggests the false titles adopted by ladies of the evening, and the gullible acceptance of such titles by romantic French gentlemen.

This interpretation of the couplet is confirmed by its context. When the Goddess Dulness advises her stationer, Edmund Curril, to present the work of Cook and Concanen to the public as being that of Swift and Prior, Pope is implying an extension of this stratagem of the harlots into the literary sphere. Curril had already deluded the town by his use of the name Joseph Gay. As Pope says in a note to line 120 of *Dunciad* II, Joseph Gay was a 'fictitious name put by Curril before several pamphlets, which made them pass for Mr. [John] Gay's'. The publishing practices of Curril thus are equated with those of the 'sage dame', the 'madam', who 'By names of Toasts retails each batter'd jade'. The dunces, of course, are the 'jades'. Lady Mary becomes a jade too, but the thrust at her and at M. Rémond ultimately appears incidental to the total context of the lines. It was easy for Pope to associate the Lady and the Frenchman with the situation existing off Drury Lane to which his lines refer—and so she 'hitched' into his rhyme.

AUBREY L. WILLIAMS

### THE COLLARS OF GURTH AND WAMBA

SIR WALTER SCOTT's treatment of history in his historical novels has been much discussed and investigated,<sup>1</sup> and his own attitude toward historical accuracy in the writing of fiction is a matter of recorded statement. In his note on the negro slaves of Brian de Bois-Guilbert in *Ivanhoe*, Scott says, after citing 'Monk' Lewis's contemptuous dismissal of critical objections to his anachronisms:

I do not pretend to plead the immunities of my order so highly as this; but neither will I allow that the author of a modern antique romance is obliged to confine himself to the introduction of those manners only which can be proved

<sup>1</sup> e.g. R. L. A. Abramczyk, *Über die Quellen zu Walter Scotts Roman Ivanhoe* (Halle, 1903); A. S. G. Canning, *History in Fact and Fiction* (London, 1897) and *History in Scott's Novels* (London, 1905); M. Korn, 'Sir Walter Scott und die Geschichte', *Anglia*, lxi (1937), 416–41; L. Maigron, *Le Roman historique à l'époque romantique: Essai sur l'influence de Walter Scott* (Paris, 1898); George Saintsbury, 'The Historical Novel', in *Essays in English Literature* (1780–1860), ser. 2 (London, 1895); J. F. Walker, 'Sir Walter Scott as a Popularizer of History', *Aberdeen University Review*, xxiii (1936), 212–25. The list could be greatly extended.

to have absolutely existed in times he is depicting, so that he restrain himself to such as are plausible and natural, and contain no obvious anachronisms. In this point of view, what can be more natural, than that the Templars, who, we know, copied closely the luxuries of the Asiatic warriors with whom they fought, should use the service of the enslaved Africans, whom the fate of war transferred to new masters? I am sure, if there are no precise proofs of their having done so, there is nothing, on the other hand, that can entitle us positively to conclude that they never did.

One example of such manners and customs as Scott discusses here, which must often have puzzled readers of Scott, and especially medievalists who have ventured so far forward in their reading as *Ivanhoe*, is the wearing of metal collars by Cedric's thralls.<sup>1</sup> I pass over the larger anachronisms of the novel, many of which have already been discussed; while as concerns others, Scott's sources for them and his reasons for believing them plausible for the time of Richard I are generally obvious enough. But these collars—from what source in early nineteenth-century notions of the Middle Ages did the suggestion for these come? They do not seem like the sort of thing that Scott would invent out of nothing, nor does he introduce them casually, as though they were a commonplace familiar to his readers. His description of Gurth ends:

One part of his dress only remains, but it is too remarkable to be suppressed; it was a brass ring, resembling a dog's collar, but without any opening, and soldered fast round his neck, so loose as to form no impediment to his breathing, yet so tight as to be incapable of being removed, excepting by the use of the file. On this singular gorget was engraved, in Saxon characters,<sup>2</sup> an inscription of the following purport:—'Gurth, the son of Beowulph, is the born thrall of Cedric of Rotherwood.'

The description of Wamba's collar is similar, but, coming second, more casual:

He had thin silver bracelets upon his arms, and on his neck a collar of the same metal, bearing the inscription, 'Wamba, the son of Witless, is the thrall of Cedric of Rotherwood.'

As a matter of fact, Scott had good enough reason to believe that metal collars were the badge of thraldom, for they were so in his time, though the metal seems to have been commonly iron, not brass, and certainly not silver. Moreover, these iron collars bore the names of the serf and of his owner. We are likely to forget that serfdom existed in the Scotland, though not in the England, of Scott's boyhood; and indeed, the agricultural serfs

<sup>1</sup> I have seen this detail noticed only once: Maigron, in *Le Roman historique*, mentions Gurth's collar but seems to think only that it is a particularly well-chosen touch in a description of authentic twelfth-century costume.

<sup>2</sup> Was Scott thinking of runes or of ordinary script of the period?

of the landowners had been freed long before this time. Nevertheless, there were still serfs in Scotland almost up to the nineteenth century. Men and women were thralled to the coal-mines and salt-pans of Scotland until 1799, the year in which Scott became sheriff-depute of Selkirkshire; and until the year 1775 nobody could enter the occupation of miner or salter without committing himself to it for life.

Accounts of these Scottish serfs appear in a number of sources,<sup>1</sup> with perhaps the fullest collection of information about them in Thomas Johnston's *History of the Working Classes in Scotland*,<sup>2</sup> from which I quote two passages:

Occasionally, too, the criminal escaped hanging, when there was a neighbouring employer of labour in need of another slave 'hand'. On the 5th of December, 1701, for example, the Commissioners of Justiciary for securing the peace of the Highlands handed over convicted thieves as perpetual and unrestricted slaves—one to the Earl of Tullibardine, and one to Sir John Erskine of Alva—and ordered brass, iron, or copper collars to be riveted around their necks.<sup>3</sup> The collar of Sir John Erskine's slave bearing the inscription, 'Alexander Steuart, found guilty of death for theft at Perth, the 5th of December, 1701, and gifted as a perpetual servant to Sir John Areskin of Alva', was dragged up in a fishing net many years afterwards in the Firth of Forth, and now lies in the Scottish Antiquarian Museum. Mr. Chambers offers the speculation that the poor fellow may have drowned himself to escape the tortures and the misery of his servitude. Again, in his 'Memorials of Allva' (p. 99), Mr. Crawford mentions a local tradition concerning two criminals who, about the beginning of the eighteenth century, were sentenced to a similar servitude, one of them said to have been fixed in the Duke of Atholl's colliery at Blairingow and the other in a colliery belonging to the Earl of Mar.<sup>4</sup>

In 1656, when Tucker, Cromwell's commissioner, wrote his report, there were evidently 20,000 people dependent for their livelihood on the coal-heughs and salt-pans, and Tucker seems to have been specially struck with the terrible condition of the salt-pan serfs. . . . The poor unfortunates condemned to this servitude in the mines and salt works became as a race apart; they were buried in unconsecrated ground; some of them wore metal collars around their necks; they were bought and sold and gifted like cattle.<sup>5</sup>

Such serfdom would seem to have become rather rare by Scott's time, but we should expect Scott to have been aware of local traditions concerning it, all the more, perhaps, if it had become somewhat striking

<sup>1</sup> e.g. Henry Cockburn, *Memorials of His Time* (Philadelphia, 1856), pp. 78–81, and Henry Grey Graham, *The Social Life of Scotland in the Eighteenth Century* (London, 1928), pp. 531–2.

<sup>2</sup> Glasgow, Forward Publishing Company, n.d. (1920?).

<sup>3</sup> Certainly a more practical way of fastening them than by soldering, as with the collars of Gurth and Wamba. A hard solder, with a high melting-point, would seem to be required, and the temperature of the collar is painful to contemplate.

<sup>4</sup> Johnston, p. 71.

<sup>5</sup> Ibid. p. 79.

because of its infrequency and seeming anachronism. The discovery of the collar of Sir John Erskine's slave seems to have excited considerable interest,<sup>1</sup> and it was probably that event that stuck in Scott's mind. So that it would almost be safe to say that the original of Gurth's and Wamba's collars now lies in the Scottish Antiquarian Museum. At all events, Scott must have been aware of the final abolition of legal serfdom in Scotland, which occurred after he had reached maturity and was engaged in the practice of law—indeed, in the very year in which it became his duty to know of the Act. And, whether from his reading of Scottish history, from his knowledge of local tradition, or from actual observation, he seems to have been aware that Scottish serfs sometimes wore inscribed metal collars and to have assumed that this was a heritage from general feudal custom.

It has, of course, been recognized from the time of their first publication that the Waverley novels depended heavily upon a rich knowledge of Scottish tradition for the details of local colour that have always fascinated their readers. It now appears that in his novels with a medieval setting, too, Scott was capable of making somewhat the same use of local and contemporary information not found in books, even for matters of historical detail.

WILLIAM W. HEIST

<sup>1</sup> See Cockburn, *Memorials*, pp. 78–81.

### CLOUGH AND *IN MEMORIAM*

THERE is a further small piece of evidence that may be thought to corroborate Mrs. Tillotson's arguments<sup>1</sup> that A. G. Butler's account of Arnold and Clough's discussion of *In Memoriam* in the summer of 1850 was founded on fact. It was in August 1850, during a visit to Italy, that Clough wrote *Peschiera* (and its continuation, *Alteram Partem*), with its strong echo of *In Memoriam*:

What voice did on my spirit fall,  
Peschiera, when thy bridge I crost?  
‘ ‘Tis better to have fought and lost,  
Than never to have fought at all.’

A. L. P. NORRINGTON

<sup>1</sup> ‘Rugby 1850: Arnold, Clough, Walrond, and *In Memoriam*’, pp. 122 ff. of this volume.

## REVIEWS

**Judith.** Edited by B. J. TIMMER. Pp. viii + 56 (Methuen's Old English Library, A. 7). London: Methuen, 1952. 5s. net.

In this most welcome addition to the poetic texts in Methuen's Old English Library, following E. V. Gordon's *Battle of Maldon* after a regrettably long interval of fifteen years, Dr. Timmer adheres to the generally accepted view that *Judith* was written by an unknown poet in the earlier decades of the tenth century, but he differs emphatically from previous editors in his forthright denial of Anglian provenance. 'It appears that the language of *Judith* is mainly late West Saxon, not too far removed from the Alfredian period. . . . There are no traces of early West Saxon. The non-West Saxon forms may be due to the fact that the poem was written down in the tenth-century language of the Worcester scriptorium in the south of England. There is nothing in the text that warrants the assumption of an Anglian origin' (Introduction, p. 5). Even forms like *gēsne* and *pēgon*, hitherto regarded as definitely non-West Saxon, he would attribute to Worcester scribal traditions spreading 'far south and eastwards' into Wessex, and he would dismiss such characteristically Anglian forms as *waldend* (ll. 5, 61), *baldor* (ll. 9, 49, 338), *alwalandan* (l. 84), *walde* (l. 206), and *aldre* (ll. 120, 347), with unfronited and therefore unbroken *a* before *-ld*, as indecisive on the ground that they are merely 'traditional words appearing in West Saxon from the earlier Anglian poetry'. As for unsyncopated forms of the third person singular present indicative, such as *seceð* (l. 96) and *hafað* (l. 197), he does not so much as mention them.

Although his dating of the poem is in complete accord with T. Gregory Foster's attractive surmise that its author intended to celebrate the glorious victories of King Alfred's daughter Æthelflaed over the Danes (A.D. 915-18), Dr. Timmer is reluctant to agree with those who would regard *Judith* as a commemorative panegyric in the manner of *Brunanburh* (A.D. 937) and *Maldon* (A.D. 991), comparing it rather with the religious epics *Juliana* and *Elene*, whose intention was not historical but timeless, and whose purpose was to fortify the reader or hearer against adversity and to demonstrate the power of steadfast faith.

In his edition of this poem contributed to the Belles-Lettres Series nearly half a century ago, A. S. Cook printed the source of the story in full as it is recorded in the Douay version of the Apocryphal book of Judith. Likewise Dr. Timmer prints what he calls 'relevant passages from the Vulgate Judith' as the sixth and concluding section of his Introduction. Unfortunately for the reader, however, by reason of numerous misprints (*quo* for *qui* three times, *conopoeum* for *conopeum*, *acceptique* for *accepitque*, *sense* for *sensu*, *juventutum* for *juventutem*, *de praedationibus* for *depraedationibus*, *perro* for *porro*, and *suppellectili* for *supellecili*), not to mention heedless omissions by which pronouns stand isolated and meaningless without antecedent nouns (e.g. from *pugionem ejus, quo* [sic] *in ea ligatus pendebat, exsolvit*, p. 15, l. 15, we are expected to understand *Holofernis pugionem, qui in columna ligatus, &c.*), the sacred text is rendered unintelligible. No further

reference is made to it, although very profitably it might have been quoted in the notes in explanation of such forms as *medowerige*, l. 229, *medowerigum*, l. 245 (glossed weakly as 'drunken with mead'), echoing *erant autem omnes fatigati a vino* of Judith xiii. 2; and *anes monðes fyrst*, l. 324, recalling *per dies autem triginta* of Judith xv. 13. Too often, in fact, the textual notes are misleading. The compound *gystern* (l. 40 n.) is not unique: as *gestern* it appears in the Rushworth Gospel of St. Luke. In *hæfde ða his ende gebidenne . . . swylcne he ær æfter worhte*, the correlative *swylcne* cannot conceivably be 'the object of *worhte*' (l. 65 n.) since it stands in apposition to *ende* and it is necessary to understand *swylcne swylcum* or *swylcne seo* 'such an end as he had worked after or deserved'. The *Hildebrandslied* is misquoted (l. 79 n.). The pronominal phrase *anra gehwylc* 'each of ones, every single individual' is of such frequent occurrence in OE. poetry that it calls for no abstruse references (l. 95 n.); moreover, it may well echo the *unusquisque* of the Vulgate source. To interpret *monna mæst morðra* as 'most of the murders of men' is pedestrian (l. 181 n.), for the poet here uses that same *ārō kowōv* construction as appears in the parallels which Dr. Timmer himself cites from *Widsith*, l. 2 (only as emended!) and from *Beowulf*, l. 2645. To change the manuscript reading *heanne ne rice to heane ne rice* rather than *heanne ne ricne* on the assumption that 'it seems more likely, on account of the following *ne* and the many *n*'s in the neighbourhood, that the scribe put one *n* too many in *heane* than that he should have left one out in *rice*' (l. 234 n.) is to ignore perversely the syntactical implications of *nanne ne sparedon* in the preceding line. For the suggested emendation *mærān madmas* (l. 329 n.), we must surely understand *mærān madmas*.

The glossary cries out for thorough revision. As it stands, it is both untidy and inaccurate. Having been told that 'æ is treated as a separate letter after a', we find *fætels* before *fág*, *gæst* before *gälferhð*, and so on. *Hellebyrne* appears as *hellebyrne: byrnwiga* and *hēan* do not appear at all. A tidy and exhaustive glossary would have been easily practicable, and it would have been of great value to students of our older vocabulary. To take one instance at random: *gelēafa*, m. n-stem, [LEVE]; belief, faith, 6, 89, etc. Why 'etc.'? Is it not of some import that this concept is expressed four times in this fragmentary text (ll. 6, 89, 97, 344), and that it never stands alone, but is always accompanied by the epithet 'firm', 'right', or 'true', *trum*, *riht*, or *sop*? Significantly, in view of the editor's own statement in the Introduction alluded to above, *gelēafa* has its place in the vocabulary of *Juliana* and *Elene*, whereas in *Brunanburh* and *Maldon* it does not appear even once.

The glossary is inaccurate in that words are assigned to wrong paradigms (e.g. *hæleð*, m. a-stem for m. eþ-stem; *þýstru*, n. ja-stem for f.-in-stem; *wīn*, m. a-stem for n. a-stem); or they appear in impossible forms (e.g. *geséah*, pret. of *gefón*, for *gefeah*; *gingra*, comp. f., for *gingre*); or they are misconstrued (e.g. *gefígnan* 'hew' for 'hear'; *geneahhe* 'urgently' for 'frequently'; *geunnan* 'grant, go' for 'grant' with a reference to l. 90; *intwidde*, adj. 'wicket' for *intidd*, adj. 'wicked'; *oferdrençan* 'intoxicate, inebriate' for 'give too much to drink, ply excessively with liquor', since the drink itself, and not the giver of the drink,

may be s  
occur: h  
wornum

Anglo-S  
sity P

The 1  
the gifts  
sooner c  
into one  
means o  
complet  
all (if we  
ranging  
English  
Kemble  
others, b  
for the t

The b  
Biogra  
as nomi  
bears th  
duction,  
in the n  
but they  
gain in  
pages, t  
day to t  
were ec  
They us  
all over  
A writ  
to be re  
nance, a  
a pre-C  
in Old S  
tion wi  
immedi  
ensuing  
ment, s  
clauses  
habiting  
another  
her edit

may be said to intoxicate). Even in the text of the poem disconcerting misprints occur: *hyne* for *hyre* (l. 123), *onlaedde* for *on ledde* (l. 129), and *wormum* for *wormum* (l. 163).

SIMEON POTTER

**Anglo-Saxon Writs.** By F. E. HARMER. Pp. xxii+604. Manchester: University Press, 1952. 56s. net.

The legal writ, and the seal pendent authenticating it, were not the least of the gifts of Anglo-Saxon England to western civilization. It was only proper that sooner or later some competent scholar should gather all extant writs together into one volume and interpret them as fully as possible to the modern reader by means of introduction, translation, and commentary. That task has now been completed by Miss Florence Elizabeth Harmer who has here edited 121 writs in all (if we include a letter of the monk Edwin concerning a Winchester concordat), ranging in time from 978 to 1075, and embracing the two official languages, English and Latin. Most of these writs have been previously printed, by J. M. Kemble (1839-48), Benjamin Thorpe (1865), W. de Gray Birch (1885-93), and others, but two authentic writs and four dubious or spurious ones are now printed for the first time.

The book is quadripartite, consisting of Introduction, Texts, Commentary, and Biographical Notes, followed by a most useful Index, which is linguistic as well as nominal and factual. This arrangement is excellent, although inevitably it bears the defects of its qualities. A fact, stated at length in the General Introduction, may be stated again in the preamble to an individual writ, and yet again in the notes on that writ. Such repetitions will doubtless seem irksome to many, but they will be readily condoned by others who appreciate the compensatory gain in precision and clarity. In the very full Introduction, covering some 120 pages, the editor traces the evolution of the writ from the sealed letter of Alfred's day to the great seal of Edward the Confessor. The clerks of the royal secretariat were ecclesiastics, many of whom subsequently rose to high office in the church. They used a conventional language whose traditional formulas were soon adopted all over the kingdom, at Canterbury and Winchester, and at Worcester and Wells. A writ had to be speedily understood and easily memorized for it was intended to be recited at the shire court or other public assembly. By alliteration, assonance, and rhyme, its formulas were interlinked, some, indeed, emanating from a pre-Christian Germanic antiquity and therefore having recorded equivalents in Old Saxon and Old High German. After the mark of the cross came the salutation with its verb of greeting in the third person (two writs only excepted), immediately followed by an abrupt change to the first person in the verb of the ensuing clause, in accordance with long-established usage. The main announcement, short or long, was succeeded, frequently but not invariably, by additional clauses expressing the motive of the decree, amplifying its provisions, and prohibiting its violation. The prohibition clause might be reinforced by a solemn *mathema*, with or without a counterbalancing benediction. Miss Harmer excels her editorial predecessors in her skilful and imaginative treatment of the problem

of authenticity. She ventures to proffer two criteria: one factual and one textual. 'Was the grant which the writ purports to announce actually made? Is the existing text the actual text produced by the clerks of the king's writing office or, if the copy is a later one, is it an unaltered copy of an authentic writ produced by the royal clerks?' (p. 111). Whether and how it may be possible to answer the first question will depend upon external evidence, and this is fully examined for each writ both in the textual introduction and in the explanatory notes. The answer to the second question will be forthcoming if it can be shown from the handwriting that the writ was produced in the royal scriptorium at some time before the death of King Edward the Confessor on 5 January 1066. For many reasons the scrutineer may find the criterion of handwriting indecisive, and he will then search for anachronisms. On the whole, however, accident and syntax are the surest marks. So formalized and so artificial is the language of the writs that any departure from inherited phraseology may point to some kind of tampering or corruption.

It is unfortunate, perhaps, that in her elucidation of linguistic details Miss Harmer does not always offer to the reader all the guidance he may need. So, for example, in her important discussion of the by-forms *insigle* and *insegel* from Latin (*in*)*tigillum*, she states that the form *insigle* 'seems to be the earlier borrowing of the two' (p. 4, n. 3). Is there any doubt? The facts are given clearly and simply by Pogatscher, to whom the reader might well be referred.<sup>1</sup> Again, in her account of *foresteall*, she indicates that this term 'may have covered several offences in the eleventh century: obstruction, waylaying, ambush. A different explanation, "assault", is given in BT. and Suppt., on the supposition that in the compound *foresteall*, *steall* means "leap, spring"; but this interpretation is probably incorrect' (p. 81). Later, in the same paragraph, she quite inconsistently refers the baffled reader to Liebermann ii. 285, s.v. 'Angriff', 'for the various senses developed by the word'. Two words, in fact, became homophonous in *steall*, one meaning 'placing' and the other 'jumping', and the two concepts were doubtless present subconsciously in the minds of speakers, even as we ourselves may still be aware of two etyma lying behind *flight* from OE. *flyht*, one deriving ultimately from *pluhti-* 'running away, fleeing', and the other from unrelated *fluhti-* 'moving as with wings, flying'. *Foresteall*, therefore, had two primary significations, 'placing before, obstruction' and 'jumping before, assault'. The second meaning, far from being 'incorrect', is unequivocally defined in the Laws of King Henry I: 'Si in via regia fiat assultus super aliquem, forestel est . . . Forestel est, si quis ex transverso incurrat, vel in via expectet et assalliat inimicum suum.'<sup>2</sup> Further, the explanation of the alliterative formulas *on lande* 7 *on loge* or *loga* and *mid lande* 7 *mid loge*, which occur in several writs, is unduly prolix and misleading. This formula consists of a tautologous word-pair meaning 'in land and place or territory', easily paralleled in the writs themselves by such characteristic synonymous expressions as *mid mæde* 7 *mid læse* 'with meadow and pasture', or *mid mæste* 7 *mid æuesan* 'with mast and pannage'. Without support-

<sup>1</sup> A. Pogatscher, *Zur Lautlehre der griechischen, lateinischen und romanischen Lehnwörter im Altenglischen* (Strassburg, 1888), §§ 78-83.

<sup>2</sup> B. Thorpe, *Ancient Laws and Institutes of England* (London, 1840), pp. 255-6.

ing evidence Miss Harmer hazards the surmise 'in land and in (? produce ? stock)', in this way disfiguring her otherwise clear translations of the writs. The substantive *log* 'place, stead' is rare, but its Germanic cognates are known, and the verb *gelogian* 'to place' is common. The phrase *on his loh* is recorded in Chronicle F.s.a. 693, where D and E, the only others containing this particular annal, read *on his steall*. In the course of her long explanatory note (pp. 462-3), Miss Harmer does in fact cite this phrase from the Chronicle, but she dismisses it at once on the assumption that 'there is no obvious connexion between this *loh* and the term under discussion, and the *loge*, *loga*, of the wris remains unexplained'. Semantically there are no insuperable difficulties, and *loh* for etymological *log*, like *beah* for *beag* and *genoh* for *genog*, is surely explicable on phonological grounds.<sup>1</sup> One further small point may be noted. Miss Harmer states that the straight or curled stroke is placed over the letter *i* 'to distinguish it, in the neighbourhood of *n*, *m*, *u*, in words like *ic*, *it*, *is*, and sometimes when the *i* is final (e.g. in *biri*). In my opinion the device is purely calligraphic' (p. 433). The device, indeed, becomes widespread in eleventh-century Latin manuscripts, and it is from this particularizing acute accent-mark that the modern practice of dotting the *i* (and tailed *i* or *j*) minuscule has found its way into all the Latin-derived alphabets of the west.

The Biographical Notes (Part IV) are well presented. Eminent names appear among them: St. Benedict, King Alfred, Queen *Ælfgifu* Emma, and Earl Godwine. Of exceptional interest is the account of *Æthelmær*, whose *gebyrd ond goodnys sind gehwær cupe*, named so gratefully by *Ælfric* in the Preface to his Homilies. The editor agrees with Miss Dorothy Whitelock that *Æthelmær* succeeded his father, the chronicler *Æthelweard*, as ealdorman of the Western Counties, in spite of the objections raised by Napier and Stevenson in their edition of the Crawford Charters and, more recently, by Robin Flower in his essay on *The Script of the Exeter Book*.

This remarkably well-produced volume is a credit to all concerned, and a most valuable addition to our growing collection of source-books for the Old English period.

SIMEON POTTER

**The Arts in the Middle English Romances.** By M. A. OWINGS. Pp. 204. New York: Bookman Associates, 1952. \$3.50.

In the main it is the applied rather than the fine arts which are here dealt with. The author's method is to give a brief account, from modern historical works, of the particular subject with which he is dealing, and then to compare and contrast the various references in the romances. The first chapter, Realism and Romance, deals with the medieval town, its situation, defences, plan, water-supply, &c. The second, on Castles, after describing their development, goes on to discuss questions of site, material, living-quarters, and general characteristics. A chapter on Architecture and Furnishings is sub-divided into Domestic and Ecclesiastical Architecture, Statues and Tombs, Ships and Wagons, Musical Instruments, Pavilions, and Implements of War. The final chapter, on the

<sup>1</sup> Sievers-Brunner, *Altenglische Grammatik*, § 214. 1.

*Supernatural*, deals with the unrealistic elements in the romances, and in this the author comes to the rather doubtful conclusion that 'reality was more akin to the temperament of the English than extravaganza'. He believes that the English romancer, 'working without foreign models, would have eliminated almost entirely all reference to the strictly fabulous'.

The plan of the work has obvious dangers which have not always been completely overcome. The distinction between history and romance is not always immediately obvious to the reader, and the position of the references, grouped together at the end of the book, does not give much help in this. There is a tendency to make vague general statements, such as 'All art had its origin in religion' (p. 115), without adding the necessary qualifications. Nor do some of the subjects dealt with, e.g. a discussion of the origin of the Grail legend, seem particularly relevant to the subject of the book.

In addition some other, rather minor, points may perhaps be noted. The use of *z* for *ȝ* is unfortunate but was presumably necessary, but the appearance of such technical terms as *bunker*, *barmkin*, *bretesche*, *crucks*, *speer*, &c., which the author is in any case obliged to define, is more difficult to justify. It is not immediately obvious why the fact that no one on board a ship could stop 'fra steryng, & fra rowyng' (*The Bruce*, line 87) necessarily indicates that the ship in question had no rudder (p. 128). No hassock is mentioned in connexion with the chair in which Gawain sat (p. 108). References on pp. 100, 106, suggest that the author may have misunderstood the meaning of the phrase 'to begin the board'. There is a surprising reference to an illustration on fol. 4 of B.M. Cotton Domitian A xcii (p. 122), and to speak of the Old English tale of the *Friar and the Boy* is, at the best, rather misleading (p. 151). The somewhat out-of-date bibliography may be responsible for some of these, and certainly a more adequate index would have helped to avoid such variations in spelling as that between *Gawayne* and *Gawain*. In addition the numerous quotations are not entirely satisfactory. Inaccuracies are rather too numerous, and omissions are not always indicated. However, it is only fair to add that such inaccuracies usually appear only in minor details of spelling and punctuation, and are rarely of importance.

Comparatively little is said about the fine arts. Murals are excluded because they have been dealt with elsewhere, but though musical instruments are described nothing is said of music, and similarly though tapestries are mentioned no attempt is made to distinguish the various kinds of fine cloth, while dress and armour are practically ignored. Perhaps most serious of all is the apparent lack of any definite purpose in the study. True, Dr. Owings decides that the romances are on the whole realistic in their treatment of the arts, but this is rather a meagre result for so much time and energy expended, and it seems that more might have been attempted. More definite answers might perhaps have been given to questions such as whether the romancers add anything to our knowledge of the arts in the medieval period? How far are the references purely descriptive, or to what extent do the romancers make use of them in the working out of the plot? Is it possible to trace a predilection for any particular subject, and are the omissions at all significant?

However  
able to t  
Most of t  
they are  
evidently  
scattered  
of his ma  
and skilful  
Some we

John Ly  
SCHIRN  
Nieme  
John L  
attention  
which, c  
another  
Germany  
application  
Schick, I  
one by  
McCrack  
poet ma  
is the fir  
gate's life  
assembla

Profes  
and liter  
work, a  
restore t  
history a  
such a r  
concise  
the first  
material  
alternat  
what pr  
in classi  
Chaucer  
Legend  
and La  
fact an  
section

It is

However, if the author has been too modest in his aims, this is perhaps preferable to the pretentiousness which is an obvious temptation in such studies. Most of the points mentioned are on the whole of minor significance only, and they are counterbalanced by some solid and obvious virtues. The author evidently knows the English romances well, and has drawn together much scattered and useful information. Considering the intractable nature of much of his material he controls it admirably, weaving it into an interesting account, and skilfully avoiding the obvious danger of degenerating into a mere catalogue. Some well-chosen plates add to the interest and value of the study.

R. M. WILSON

**John Lydgate: Ein Kulturbild aus dem 15. Jahrhundert.** By WALTER F. SCHIRMER. Pp. xii+255 (Buchreihe der Anglia, 1. Band). Tübingen: Max Niemeyer, 1952. DM. 27.

John Lydgate can scarcely be said to have received from English scholars the attention which, considered historically, his work deserves, or the deference which, considered as literature, it probably does not; and the present work is another example of the repair of this English deficiency by a scholar from Germany. Professor Schirmer is carrying on a tradition of interest in and application to Lydgate begun in the late years of the last century by Zupitza, Schick, Koeppel, and Glauning, and maintained in the first three decades of this one by students in the United States such as Miss Hammond, Bergen, and McCracken; a tradition beside whose accomplishment English studies of the poet make a somewhat small showing. It is perhaps surprising to note that this is the first full-length published study, either in English or in German, of Lydgate's life, work, and milieu, and must therefore have a considerable value as an assemblage of information, apart from any merit it may possess as a revaluation.

Professor Schirmer has long been interested in fifteenth-century English life and literature (his *Der englische Frühhumanismus* was published in 1935), and this work, as might be expected, is an attempt to set Lydgate in his age and to restore them both to a position of importance for the study of English literary history and in particular of the English Renaissance. It is perhaps a pity that in such a relatively small volume so much has been attempted, since the need to be concise seems sometimes to have forced the author into a difficult position. In the first place it has meant the adoption of a rather rigid systematization of material: it is doubtful whether a coherent picture can be presented by the alternation with each other of sections of biography, *politisches Zeitbild* and somewhat pedestrian literary criticism. It is also doubtful whether there is any value in classifying Lydgate's works into 'First works: the *Troy Book*: Poems about the Chaucer family: the *Story of Thebes*: Satires: Mumming: Didactic Poetry: Legends of the Saints: Religious Lyrics: Moral Didactics: the *Fall of Princes*: and Last Works'—each division valuable for its summary of content, scholarly fact and opinion, but lacking real connexion with previous and subsequent sections.

It is surprising also to note that Professor Schirmer can refer to 'the courtly

themes of the worldly poet Chaucer', a view of Lydgate's avowed master which is bound to falsify at least some of what the author has to say about the literary relations of Chaucer's contemporaries and successors. There is no evidence to show that Lydgate ever made the mistake of regarding Chaucer merely as a 'rose of rhetoris' or as 'worldly'.

Besides these faults one might mention others: notably an equation of literary with literal truth, which appears in the acceptance of the *Testament*, a conventional palinode, as a source for the early biography of the poet; and the paucity of reference to manuscript sources. More information on the circulation of Lydgate prints and manuscripts in both England and Scotland during the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries would have been a welcome and effective aid towards the assessment of his reputation and influence, besides being of rather more value than references, in the *Exkuse on Lydgates Ruhm*, to the *Concise Cambridge History*, Legouis-Cazamian and Grierson-Smith. Incidentally, perhaps H. S. Bennett's *Chaucer and the Fifteenth Century* would have been better worth a mention in such a note.

Some other minor omissions are to be recorded. Presumably Johnstone Parr's article, 'Astronomical Dating for some of Lydgate's Poems' (*P.M.L.A.*, lxvii, no. 2), appeared too late for Professor Schirmer to make use of its conclusions. But there might have been a reference to the works of Constans on the Theban legend in the section on the *Story of Thebes*; and in the note on the sources of the same poem Boccaccio's *De Genealogiis Deorum* should have been mentioned. The work of Bergen on Lydgate's vocabulary deserved notice.

There is a considerable number of mis-citations; quotation and transcription are sometimes inaccurate; and there is an occasional failure to specify, at first citation, what edition of a work is being used. A smother of misprints is to be found among the English words in the notes. In spite of these defects, the book is painstaking and admirable as a handbook, a summary of available material about the poet, and contains a large number of useful references. Its price in England (£2. 9s. 6d. for an unbound volume of less than 300 pages) seems excessive even for the present time.

J. B. TRAPP

**More's *Utopia*. The Biography of an Idea.** By J. H. HEXTOR. Pp. xii+171 (The History of Ideas series, No. 5). Princeton: Princeton University Press; London: Geoffrey Cumberlege, 1952. \$3.00; 20s. net.

In this admirable study of More's *Utopia* Mr. Hexter sets out his conviction that there was no reason why More should have concealed the general intention of his treatise, and proceeds to discover it in the circumstances of its composition. We have it on Erasmus's authority that Book II was written during More's embassy in the Netherlands in 1515 and Book I in London during the following year. Mr. Hexter shows that the discourse of Book II was conceived as a traveller's tale and concludes that Hythlodaeus must have been the narrator. Hence the passage introducing him in Book I (pp. 23-32 in Lupton's edition, Oxford, 1895) must have formed part of the original version. The dialogue of Book I,

as well as its conclusion after Hythloday's discourse in Book II (Lupton, pp. 34-114 and 307-9), was probably written in London on the particular occasion of Erasmus's visit and under the impact of repeated conversations with him. This is penetrating criticism and there is no difficulty in reconciling it with Erasmus's simplified statement in his letter to Ulrich von Hutten three years later. It is, moreover, what I think many readers of *Utopia* must have sensed, although, curiously enough, nobody has previously put it into writing. Here lies Mr. Hexter's real contribution to knowledge.

The author's interpretation of the contents of *Utopia*, orthodox, as he claims, in the main, derives clarity and conviction from the separate analysis of Books I and II. But surely he is wrong in making such a rigorous distinction between communism on the one hand and Utopian religion and philosophy on the other. Verisimilitude, he thinks, prevented More from attributing Christianity to 'a region of the world where the light of the Christian Gospel had never shone', whereas he was at liberty to attribute to them any secular institutions he liked (p. 50). But More actually makes 'many of them' embrace Christianity (Lupton, pp. 268-9), and if he had wanted to describe a Christian commonwealth he was certainly at liberty to have had his Utopians converted by a possible predecessor of Hythloday; alternatively, he might have placed *Utopia* elsewhere, even anticipating in some measure his son's translated account of the realm of Prester John. But, as Chambers has shown, the whole point of *Utopia* was that it should be pagan, or it could not have so forcibly put Christians to shame. That More himself had a great penchant for theoretical communism is indisputable, and Erasmus tells us that as a young man he had written a dialogue in defence of Platonic communism including the community of women.<sup>1</sup> But neither Platonic nor Utopian communism could have been his ultimate ideal. With More, Christianity must always come first. Hence also Hythloday's glowing appeal at the end of his discourse (Lupton, p. 306) to the example of Christ and the first small Christian community. It was an appeal of which More's spiritual father, Dean Colet, who was himself trying to restore the spirit of the early Church among his clergy, must have approved. When he quotes Budé in his support Mr. Hexter seems to forget that Budé speaks of 'Udepotia' and 'Hagnopolis' (Lupton, pp. lxxxvii, lxxxix-xci.) He might also have remembered Beatus Rhenanus who said that More taught a more Christian doctrine than Plato and Aristotle. And when he accuses 'present-day scholars' of reading 'a defence of private property' into *Utopia* (p. 47), he is talking nonsense. All that writers of Chambers's school of thought have maintained is that the description of *Utopia* was not a political programme and that More not only did not wish to introduce communism into the England of Henry VIII but even firmly resisted such ideas.<sup>2</sup> Such insistence has been necessary to counter the Marxist interpretation, but in all polemics there is a danger of the distortion of critical bias and Mr. Hexter has done well to make his point. He is, however, on firmer ground when he concludes that

<sup>1</sup> *Opus Epistolarum Des. Erasmi Roterodami*, ed. P. S. Allen, IV, No. 999, p. 21.

<sup>2</sup> This is furthermore borne out by Father Edward L. Surtz's admirable article on 'Thomas More and Communism', *P.M.L.A.*, lxiv (1949), pp. 559-64, to which Mr. Hexter also refers with respect.

More condemned Pride (pp. 75-76, 79-81) than when he thinks he condemned private property (pp. 42-43). In recognizing that More was concerned with 'higher ends' than economics (p. 71) Mr. Hexter should have seen also that if Utopian philosophy 'is not a sure guide to his own philosophical and religious views' (p. 51), neither is Utopian communism a better guide to his practical programme of social reform.

Whether More believed that men were actually capable of attaining 'the Good Society', as Mr. Hexter maintains (p. 58), is hazardous to say in view of the constant burden of his writings that the world is so wretched and full of absurdity and faults everywhere and 'in every age since Christendom began' that there is nothing perfect in it. It is true that he did not make his Utopians all good, but was it less of a fiction to make them all reasonable? What is certain is that he believed many evils might be mitigated by reasonable dealing, and this is the sum of the First Book of *Utopia*. Mr. Hexter is perhaps more than a trifle doctrinaire in his obstinate refusal under any circumstances to identify the author with the More of the dialogue, and I have a feeling that he makes More also more of a doctrinaire than he actually was (pp. 135-6). He has caught much of the serious side of More but less of his hilarity. Thus he is tempted to treat Book II also as an ideal social order (which indeed in a relative sense it was, but not absolutely) rather than a work of wit, imagination, and learning.

Perhaps it will not be taken amiss if in so excellent a book one were to point out one or two little slips. Though without his permission, the Paris edition of *Utopia* could not very well have appeared without More's knowledge (p. 47), seeing that it was prefaced with a second letter to Peter Giles. It seems a little rash to attribute the marginal notes to Erasmus (p. 44), when Peter Giles expressly stated them to be by himself (Lupton, p. xviii).

Mr. Hexter's book is eloquently written. It contains both shrewd and accurate criticism and should not be overlooked by any lover of More and of *Utopia*.

H. W. DONNER

**Poets on Fortune's Hill. Studies in Sidney, Shakespeare, Beaumont and Fletcher.** By JOHN F. DANBY. Pp. 212. London: Faber & Faber, 1952. 18s. net.

The title of Mr. Danby's book (which alludes to the speech of the Poet in *Timon of Athens*) does not do full justice to its contents. Perhaps indeed no title could, for the only serious fault of this very interesting book is that it tries to do too much, or too many things at once. Its most valuable theme is thus summarized in advance: '... Sidney's *Arcadia* has more in common with Shakespeare's *Lear* and *Pericles* than these have with the plays of Beaumont and Fletcher. Shakespeare and Sidney (in ways which remain to be indicated) are somehow members of the same moral community. Beaumont and Fletcher, using the same theatre as Shakespeare, belong to a different world' (p. 17). But 'when', as Mr. Danby says, '[literary] "influences"' are seen in relation to social placing, and social place is seen to imply a whole *ethos*, intellectual, temperamental and spiritual', the result becomes somewhat complex.

At a first reading the book may well leave the impression of a patchwork. An initial chapter deals with the practical difficulties of a poet's career in Elizabethan and Jacobean times, and seeks to relate them to the chief changes in social organization. A chapter on Sidney's *Arcadia* then shows the profundity and poetic power of its treatment of the theme of Fortune. The mood and teaching of the *Arcadia* are then shown to be closely akin to those of Shakespeare's last plays: the chief text is *Pericles*, and it is instructive to see how much in this and the other 'romances' springs from an 'old-fashioned' literary form and a correspondingly 'old-fashioned' moral sensibility. A chapter is given to the treatment of treacherous Fortune in *King Lear*; and a chapter on *Antony and Cleopatra*, here interpolated, reaches a negative conclusion: this and its companion *Coriolanus* only show characters in whom a right attitude to Fortune is conspicuously lacking. Two concluding chapters on Beaumont and Fletcher argue that they represent an inferior system of moral values, which is connected with their dubious position and the changing atmosphere of their time. They were gentlemen, yet careerists; they celebrated the existing social order, yet sought to exploit its vices and weaknesses.

The substance of these studies is of great interest, but Mr. Danby is inclined on the one hand to over-explain, on the other to assume too much. He spends more space explaining the virtue of Christian patience he finds in *King Lear* than in showing its place in the play; his analysis of Sidney's prose contains a good deal of repetition. Yet in passages of 'social' content he gives way to unconvincing (and unnecessary) generalizations: 'The sixteenth century heralds the appearance of the managerial element in political affairs. . . . Arguments as to whether the Privy Council ruled through the Queen, or the Queen through the Privy Council, are largely academic; they are certainly not true to the psychology of Elizabeth's last ten years' (p. 26).

In his judgements of those works on which he spends most time Mr. Danby shows a certain tendency to deviate. While he brings out neglected virtues in the *Arcadia*, he does so only at the cost of some exaggeration of its final value. His enthusiasm for sustained and subtly organized moral instruction leads him to over-value Sidney, and place him alone with Shakespeare. The comparison is not even wholly to the latter's advantage: 'Shakespeare grew, naturally. But it is only his maturest work that suggests a pattern maybe even wider than Sidney's plan' (p. 73). The moral integrity Shakespeare shared with Sidney is indeed the basis of his power. But Shakespeare's extraordinary poetic genius, his power of projecting and animating human actions in verse, sets him almost from the beginning on a level of artistic achievement to which Sidney could never aspire.

The critic's tendency to be swept away by his own insight reappears in his evaluation of Beaumont and Fletcher. He accepts that view of their work formulated by Coleridge and Lamb and repeated by Mr. T. S. Eliot. But he becomes so fascinated by the degree and consistency of their moral perversity that he begins to interpret it in terms which suggest admiration: 'Beaumont is able to bring off what are sometimes taken for perversions of character to situation, or of emotional coherence to rhetorical opportunity, but which, I think, are better regarded as so many moral puns. He achieves something more important than

mere surprise, more significant than stage-tricks; something which has to do with his feeling for radical dislocation—a dislocation which can express itself in incongruities macabre, comic, or harrowing as the occasion demands' (p. 189). Mr. Danby's fascinated horror in contemplating *The Maid's Tragedy* leads him to assert that 'as a study in radical perversity Evadne is more compelling than Lady Macbeth, and more subtle' (p. 193). But the fact is that Beaumont does not 'bring off' his incongruities: they are neither amusing when 'comic' nor harrowing when 'tragic'. In either case they may very often merely disgust. Their chief interest consists in their revelation of the psychology of the poet, and this is the interest that has deceived Mr. Danby.

F. T. PRINCE

**King Lear.** Edited by KENNETH MUIR. Pp. lxiv+256. (The Arden Shakespeare [new and revised edition]. General Editor: UNA ELLIS-FERMOR.) London: Methuen, 1952. 18s. net.

The New Arden edition of *King Lear* is a feat of compression. In an Introduction no longer than Craig's, Professor Muir has given a discriminating account of what has been done on the play since Craig's original edition of 1901; he has revised very thoroughly the collation and explanatory notes; and he has also included (without exceeding the original edition by more than a few pages) thirty-six pages of extracts from Shakespeare's sources (the 1605 *Leir* play, Holinshed, Spenser, Higgins, Sidney, Florio, and Harsnett). Craig's edition was among the best of the original series but, admirable as it was in its day, it needed revision and its Introduction in particular had become a period piece of textual and literary criticism. Its successor will undoubtedly be welcomed.

The outstanding feature of the Introduction is its clarity and poise. A lucid synopsis of critical opinion on the text occupies no more than five pages. There is a similarly succinct and level-headed survey of the evidence for the play's date, followed by a brisk and illuminating discussion of the sources; and finally some twenty pages on what has been made of *Lear*, on the stage and in the study, with special reference to recent work.

In the Introduction, Professor Muir's aim has been primarily to co-ordinate, and this is, I think, what is mainly wanted by students, who need to know the facts but are not required (or qualified) to contribute anything at first hand to questions of transmission, date, and sources. But where the understanding of the play is in question their main concern is the play, not its critics, and they must make what they can of it for themselves. I doubt if the Babel of critical opinion, with which Professor Muir deals so patiently, is as helpful as a less hampered personal approach might have been. The young do not take to *Lear*, partly because they fail to recognize the dramatic link between the enigmas, paradoxes, and hyperboles of its language and its theme, and partly because they fail (like some critics) to surmount the obstacle of the exposition. Bridie's opinion on p. liii ('arrogant old idiot') seems quite unpardonable. Lear's 'poor judgment' and 'rashness' are dramatically overshadowed in i. i by his regal temper (in every sense of the word) and this is the necessary dramatic prologue (as the division

of the kingdom and the banishment of Cordelia and Kent are the plot prologue) to what follows. A survey of opinions (sentimental, moral, optimistic, pessimistic) obscures the fundamental problem of why this audacious play is dramatically Shakespeare's greatest achievement.

Professor Muir has revised Craig's collation notes very thoroughly and a searching examination has revealed only a few unimportant errors. He has wisely recorded the readings of Q<sub>2</sub> and also conjectural emendations where a reading common to the Quarto and Folio is questionable. Since the agreement of the substantive editions may be due to the Folio's having inherited an error from the quarto, some of these conjectures might have been adopted and so too might a number more, recorded in the Old Cambridge edition: Warburton's 'candent' at I. iv. 294 and Sympson's 'tired' at II. iv. 135. And can 'deprive' be right at I. ii. 4? 'Deprave' would be more appropriate in meaning and more in Shakespeare's equivocal manner. A start must one day be made on the emendation of errors common to the Quarto and Folio and the present-day interest in Shakespeare's language and imagery would seem to make a beginning opportune.

Professor Muir's explanatory notes should similarly prove more serviceable than his predecessor's, judicious as Craig's were. The majority are perforce lexicographical (and in this respect Professor Muir is very thorough) but Craig's basis has been broadened to cover dramatic points and imagery. There are a few slips. The explanation of IV. i. 27-28, for instance, seems to me wide of the mark, possibly due to taking off on the wrong foot at IV. i. 1-2 with the Folio punctuation. But with very few exceptions, and in principle, the explanatory notes are what students need.

What I do not like about this edition is its text. For this, Professor Muir is not entirely to blame, since the acceptance of Folio readings (unless manifestly absurd) has been widely approved in recent years. In theory his text is, like Duthie's, eclectic. In fact, it does not seem to me anything of the kind. I cannot believe that any editor, exercising freedom of choice, could seriously prefer 'the thunder' to 'their thunders' at II. i. 46 or 'Being oil to fire' to 'Bring oil to fire' at II. ii. 78. The more genuinely eclectic methods of the Old Cambridge editors and Craig resulted in better texts. A modest estimate of the number of printing-house errors in this Folio text (on the evidence of other plays set by the compositor responsible for it) would be not less than 200. In view of the careless setting of much of the Folio, it is clear that, even if the authority of a Folio text is the higher, what Housman argued in his prefaces to *Manilius* and *Juvenal* is, in principle, valid and that a conservative attitude towards the more authoritative text will result in the preservation of a considerable number of compositor's errors, which are naturally inferior in sense, dramatic significance, or style.

Apart from my strong objections to his text, it seems to me that Professor Muir has performed a Herculean task. An enormous amount of strenuous work has been put into his edition and what he has managed to pack into his pages can be nothing to what he has had to omit for lack of space. His point of view is always reasonable and responsible; and students, teachers, and editors will find this work helpful and stimulating.

ALICE WALKER

**Shakespeare's Motley.** By LESLIE HOTSON. Pp. x+133. London: Rupert Hart-Davis, 1952. 21s. net.

Dr. Hotson has made yet another notable discovery of cozenage. Actors, scholars, and lexicographers have all been deluded into the belief that Shakespeare's Fools were dressed in the parti-coloured jerkin, the parti-coloured tights, and the hood made familiar to us by stage productions. In fact they wore the costume of 'naturals'—a long coat of coarse woollen stuff, with a cap. Motley, as Dr. Hotson shows by quotations from Robert Armin and others, was a cloth of mixed colour, like a homespun or tweed. This discovery should influence not only the costumes of Fools on the modern stage, but also the way the parts are played.

After a digression in which he argues that the 'gentle spirit' in *The Teares of the Muses* and Action in *Colin Clouts Come Home Again* are both Shakespeare—an identification which depends on an early dating of the Sonnets—Dr. Hotson proceeds to throw light on a number of Elizabethan words and phrases (e.g. *cloakbag*, *poke*, *impeticos thy gratillity*) and to give an account of Armin which not only contains additional facts but also links his craft of goldsmith with the names Touchstone and Sir Topas (Topaz), and with Feste's praise of Orsino—'thy mind is a very opal'. The book contains some interesting comments on several Shakespearian characters, including Pompey Bum and Hamlet.

It is legitimate to speculate that Armin may have played Polonius and Menenius, but on some matters Dr. Hotson would seem to go beyond the evidence. He declares that Shakespeare never linked motley with patched, though Feste discourses on virtue 'patched with sin' in a way which would receive additional point if his own garb were patched. In commenting on Petruchio's 'old mothy saddle', Dr. Hotson suggests that the word is a misprint for motley, but since he refers to the fact that the same 'misprint' occurs in Florio's Italian-English dictionary and elsewhere, it is more likely to be a genuine variant. Then he admits that confusion between the epithets motley and parti-coloured did occur in Elizabethan dictionaries, but he does not draw the obvious conclusion that motley was frequently used for parti-coloured. Dekker, being a dramatist, must have been aware of the Hotsonian meaning of the word, but in *The Wonderful Yeare* he associates a motley-loom with a beggar's cloak, 'full of stolne patches'.

Sometimes Dr. Hotson takes a metaphor too literally. We need not assume that Sonnet 146 is a personal confession, that Shakespeare wore rich clothes, nor even that Junius Brutus wore a Fool's garments because Shakespeare says he covered 'Discretion with a Coat of Folly'. It is surely not true that the stanzas of Gervasse Markham were ascribed to Marlowe by modern critics on stylistic grounds. No one would have ascribed them to Marlowe if they had not appeared above his name in *England's Parnassus*. It is an assumption, to say the least, to suppose that the small spots on Will Summer's coat in the frontispiece were meant to indicate the motley colour. Finally, even if the whore's bully wore the long motley coat and wooden side-arms, it is by no means certain that Philo meant that Anthony was degraded to this level when he called him 'a strumpet's fool'.

KENNETH MUIR

**Shakespeare in the Theatre 1701-1800: A Record of Performances in London, 1701-1750.** By CHARLES BEECHER HOGAN. Pp. xiv+517. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1952. 42s. net.

For those unacquainted with Mr. Hogan's particular line of study it should be explained that this record is the first half of the fully documented source-book he has had to prepare as a preliminary reference work in order to pursue his own investigations of the treatment accorded to the Shakespearian texts on the eighteenth-century stage. He found that the necessary information as to when, where, and by whom the plays were acted was incomplete and frequently inaccurate, and in this and the promised volume for 1750-1800 he is putting his essential research equipment at the disposal of other scholars. Individuals like the present reviewer, who for their own purposes consulted the oracle before publication, have already realized that, unlike his classic predecessors, Mr. Hogan always gives satisfaction. He is the answer to the researcher's prayer for the reliable Yes or No, the fact or the date, that by the honest magic of thorough and systematic work saves us from the burden of fruitless hours. What we could not anticipate is the remarkable feat of orderly arrangement with which the published work presents us, whereby masses of material are made to yield the required facts and we are enabled to find them at once; and we shall probably not realize its full range of helpfulness until we have the whole work at our disposal and have grown accustomed to using it.

For the student of drama Mr. Hogan simplifies his records by using the calendar year instead of the average September-to-May theatrical season of some 180 acting nights. As there are practically no play-bills for these early years he has had to collect his facts from the newspaper announcements, and his main source is the British Museum's Burney Newspapers. Like Genest he has also used Burney's manuscript Theatrical Register, and for the period 1702-46 F. Latreille's manuscript transcriptions of newspaper bills which he describes as 'the most accurate account ever written of the London stage' for those years. Among other sources he has drawn upon the files of the *Daily Courant* belonging to Yale and the New York Historical Society for 1702-9 and 1717-24; Harvard's and the Folger Shakespeare Library's manuscript accounts for Lincoln's Inn Fields; the Folger's MS. diary kept by the Drury Lane prompters, and other British Museum manuscripts.

The material is arranged as follows: (1) performances, listed chronologically, under theatres; (2) plays, listed alphabetically, giving chronology, also casts when known; (3) index of actors, giving all their parts; (4) index of characters, giving all performers; (5) a summary (approximate only) indicating by comparison with the total number of plays performed the popularity of the Shakespeare plays; (6) a list showing the comparative popularity of the Shakespeare plays *inter se*; (7) brief histories of the theatres in use in this period—six majors and twenty minors, including booths, inns, and halls. Mr. Hogan also analyses the sources used for each theatre and for the nightly receipts which are given whenever available, and earns our gratitude for the clear half-page plot-summaries which he gives for all the adapted versions of the plays. Benefits are noted, and all

changes of cast. The benefits, incidentally, yield some delightful extras, such as the Drury Lane 1750 *Merchant of Venice* which realized £210 for 'a young gentlewoman distress'd by the bankruptcy of her guardian'. One was devoted to the fund for the William Kent memorial statue to Shakespeare in Westminster Abbey: another to the Lock Hospital; and another to 'a brave soldier that suffered extremely at the battle of Dettingen'. *The Tempest* was most appropriately given for 'the brave and unfortunate crew' of *The Prince of Orange* who were 'shipwreck'd in a tempest in Margate Road and stood upon the wreck upwards of twelve hours, with the sea beating over them, before they were relieved'.

The play-record opens with *The Tempest* at Drury Lane on 1 January 1701, *Timon* on the 17th, *The Tempest* again on 7 February and 4 March, and the *Caius Marius* version of *Romeo and Juliet* on 12 April, with a single performance of *The Jew of Venice* at Lincoln's Inn Fields. From this meagre showing it mounts to the peak period of 1741–50, when, out of a total of 4,016 plays, 1,123 were Shakespeare's, coinciding, of course, with Garrick's rise to fame. The first receipts recorded are for Lincoln's Inn Fields in 1715, where *Timon* and *The Jew of Venice* show, respectively, bumper benefit takings of £158 and £124 odd. Receipts for Covent Garden begin in 1732, where a 1733 *Timon* benefit brings in some £275. Drury Lane accounts begin in 1747, where Spranger Barry's *Othello* benefit (9 March 1749) takes £289—the biggest sum recorded here.

It will surprise no one to find *Hamlet* the most popular, with 358 performances, and *Macbeth* second with 287. Falstaff makes *The Merry Wives* by far the most popular of the comedies, with 202 performances. Not acted within this half-century are *Antony and Cleopatra*, *Lover's Labour's Lost*, and *Two Gentlemen of Verona*. What may come as a shock, even to those acquainted with such specimens of contemporary taste as the Davenant adaptations or the Nahum Tate *Lear*, is the realization that the only plays which escaped the adaptors were *Hamlet*, *Othello*, *1 Henry IV*, *Julius Caesar*, *Henry VIII*, *All's Well*, *Winter's Tale*, and *1 Henry VI*. The surprisingly popular *Timon* (89 performances) was always played as altered by Shadwell.

Space forbids detailed illustration of the various uses the individual can make of Mr. Hogan's material, but enough has been said to indicate its value and fascination. I fancy that behind this uncompromisingly austere work of reference there lurks the vision of an important book and a sureness of objective which are the only things that could have sustained an author in these preliminary labours. Its publication is an act of faith on the part of all concerned, made in the belief that scholarly apparatus for the study of the plays in the theatre is going to become as essential to serious students of drama as bibliographical work proved itself earlier this century for the study of the text. In conclusion, all who know the working partnership of Mr. Hogan and his wife will take pleasure in his acknowledgement of 'a debt without measure' and the tribute 'This book is as much hers as it is mine'.

M. ST. CLARE BYRNE

**Poems by Nicholas Breton (not hitherto reprinted).** Edited, with biography, canon, and notes, by JEAN ROBERTSON. Pp. clx+229 (Liverpool English Texts and Studies). Liverpool: University Press, 1952. 30s. net.

The unassuming, prolific, and amiable muse of Nicholas Breton has for too long been accessible only in A. B. Grosart's not very attractive edition of 1879. Miss Robertson's volume goes some way to explaining this state of affairs. Works which Grosart was unable to print are at last available to scholars, since they have crossed the Atlantic into the courteous keeping of the H. E. Huntington and Folger libraries. From copies there Miss Robertson prints *The works of a young wyt, Pasquils Mistresse, Olde Mad-cappes new Gally-mawfrey*, and poems from *The Soules Heauenly Exercise*. She omits *Brittons Boure of Delights*, already edited by Professor H. E. Rollins, and adds from the British Museum *Honest Counsaile* and *The Uncasing of Machiuils Instructions*. To these she adds a short-title list of the works which comprise the Breton canon, with discussions of authenticity. The commentary is thorough, easy, and admirably level-headed. It does not profess to be a complete bibliography but supplies the Elizabethan student with a survey of what we may assume to represent Breton's output. The close and exacting labour which this has entailed is very considerable, and here we have the second reason why this particular field has lain for so long untilled. It is enough to daunt the stoutest heart.

How much is Breton worth the tilling? The number of editions through which his books went is evidence of his popularity in his own day, as is the rarity of surviving exemplars. Breton's booklets were the kind that is read to pieces. The time-span which his work covers is remarkable. His first recorded publication is dated 1575 and his last 1622. It seems probable, as Miss Robertson conjectures, that by then, and indeed before, he must have been in the rear of literary fashion and suffering for it financially. Some of his work is plainly pot-boiling. Yet the kind of audience to which Breton chiefly appealed is not one of the most sensitive to tides of taste. His simplicity and homeliness, as they were never perhaps very much in, can never have been very much out.

Breton is, in fact, always himself, and whatever age he lived in his verse would only superficially vary. In this, as in some other respects, he resembles a very much more gifted poet of 'idle toys', Robert Herrick. Miss Robertson draws attention to a likeness in their subject-matter. The likeness is in more than that. They have a similar wide range, a similar low pitch, a similar light touch, and above all the impress of a distinct (and pleasant) personality.

It may seem odd to claim that Nicholas Breton, stepson of George Gascoigne and like him a poet of the rather obscure 1570s, is not a typical Elizabethan. A wider acquaintance with his poetry, such as is made possible by a publication like this, will perhaps modify our views of what constitutes a 'typical Elizabethan'. We shall have to make room among the Petrarchan elegants for Breton's colloquial ease, and set alongside the refined artifice of pastoral and Neoplatonism that closeness to contemporary life of which not only Deloney but, in his own way, Breton is an instance. His language is not by any means the stereotyped poetic diction of his day and he shows a nice appreciation of the value of home-

spun word and phrase, commoner in the dramatists than the poets. For the student of language he is a gold-mine. Miss Robertson notes how, in more than one place, Breton's usage antedates the earliest example in the *O.E.D.* His facile rhyming should also repay the linguist. The student of manners will find in *The works of a young wyt* a description of an Elizabethan dance and 'trifling banquet' which might have come straight from *Romeo and Juliet*—not, certainly, as the lovers saw it; not even as Mercutio saw it, since Breton's 'young wyt' lacks both edge and brilliance; nor does he join the Nurse's bawdy chatter, for his muse is chaste—but there it all is, a piece of detailed and genial reporting.

This genial temper unsuits him for satire, upon which he is none the less sufficiently in the fashion to embark about the turn of the century; but his lament for the good old days, sauced by lively realistic sketches of some of the less commendable aspects of the new, undoubtedly gave a wide audience the kind of emotional satisfaction it desired from this genre.

The intellectual qualities of satire are outside Breton's scope, as is the intellectual capacity to order his work and give it more than surface significance. He certainly writes with his readers very much in mind, but that he writes down can only be credited if there are signs of his being able to write much better than he in fact does. The power of a deep, simple, and uncritical emotion to vivify his verses is illustrated in this collection by the poems from *The Soules Heauenly Exercise*.

If the texts here made for the first time easily accessible do not alter in any special respect the general picture of Breton as a writer, they are enough in themselves to establish him as a writer with an individual contribution to make, worth the care accorded him by an admirably careful editor, and the place he now holds in the series sponsored by Liverpool University. There is room for more of Breton. This is a beginning.

AGNES M. C. LATHAM

**A Critical Study of William Drummond of Hawthornden.** By FRENCH ROWE FOGLE. Pp. xviii+236. New York: King's Crown Press; London: Geoffrey Cumberlege, 1952. \$3.25; 21s. net.

Drummond of Hawthornden is a poet whose reputation has suffered by the researches of his editors. After L. E. Kastner's merciless exposure of his borrowings (in his edition of 1913), he seemed at first to have been left with little claim to be regarded as an original artist. M. Joly's study (Lille, 1934) and Miss R. C. Wallerstein's article in *P.M.L.A.*, xlvi (1933) did something to restore the balance. Mr. Fogle follows in their footsteps. This book concentrates on the intrinsic merits of Drummond's poetry and attempts to show that, in spite of its acknowledged derivativeness, it is the authentic expression of an individual personality. Mr. Fogle justifies or at any rate excuses Drummond's imitativeness by relating it to the familiar Renaissance doctrine of imitation. But he also recognizes that the only real justification for imitation is the success achieved by it. Drummond's poetry has often a limpid melody and a certain simplicity and freshness of outlook which revitalize familiar themes and stale conceits. Mr. Fogle frequently draws attention to the beauty of such passages.

Undoubtedly, however, the most interesting thing about Drummond is that sombre pensiveness of outlook which, appearing first in 'Tears on the Death of Moeliades' as a vein of philosophic melancholy, developed later, particularly after the death of his bride-to-be, Mary Cunningham, into a complete *contemptus mundi*. It is, as Mr. Fogle shows, this 'darker strain' which makes Drummond something more than simply the familiar type of cultured Renaissance gentleman. He wrote his best poetry under its inspiration, yet even here he did not eschew imitation. Imitation was essential to him: the thoughts of others helped him to make articulate his own feelings, but the feelings were genuine and their ultimate expression was his own. Mr. Fogle's defence is mainly along these lines, yet he seems to me to weaken that defence by the attitude which he adopts to the question of Drummond's Platonism. This, to my mind, is the most challenging part of the book, yet the assertion that Drummond uses Platonic materials merely for decorative purposes and not because he holds Platonic views undermines the earlier emphasis on the philosophic strain in his poetry. It is true that Drummond does not present in his poems any unified or complete Platonic system, and that his Platonism is generally subordinated to his Christianity. He was content, like others of his time, to blend his Christianity and Platonism easily and loosely, 'without a rigid definition'. But the 'outflying' character of the Platonic philosophy accorded well with his taste for transcendentalism and provided him with more than just a poetic drapery.

The arrangement of the book also tends to obscure its theme. Each chapter deals with a different form or type of verse—sonnet, madrigal, occasional pieces, &c. This involves retracing Drummond's development several times, since the sensibility he displays at a given date in the sonnet does not differ markedly from that which he displays at the same date in, say, the madrigal. It also leads to an artificial separation between the Sonnets of the *Poems 1616* (First and Second Parts) and the Songs, where in fact the resemblance in theme is so much more important than the difference in form. Mr. Fogle's intention seems to have been to show that 'the pattern of his development was the same in all the forms he used'; this seems, however, rather a small point to have determined the shape of the work.

Mr. Fogle has, then, some sensible things to say on Drummond, though his remarks are not always presented to the best advantage. His concluding chapter sums up well and lucidly, so much so that one wonders whether his material would not have been better confined to an article rather than lengthened out into a book which states the obvious rather too frequently. On the whole, this is a study that will be more useful to the newcomer to Drummond, than to a reader already familiar with his work. The former may be stimulated by it to read Drummond's poetry; the latter will learn little that he does not know already. He will, however, be grateful for the reproduction of Drummond's reading lists, compiled by him from 1606 to 1614, and for the generous selection from the unpublished poems still in the Hawthornden manuscripts. The critical apparatus is at all times admirable.

JOAN GRUNDY

**Edward Benlowes 1602-1676. Biography of a Minor Poet.** By HAROLD JENKINS. Pp. x+371. London: The Athlone Press, 1952. 35s. net.

This volume adds a great deal to what has hitherto been known about Edward Benlowes. Wood's account, too readily trusted in later references, is misleading as well as brief. The present work, much of it based on material freshly delved out of public records, is both detailed and exact. Dr. Jenkins's sympathy for his subject is neither exaggerated nor condescending and his style has an unassuming ease which enhances the human interest of Benlowes's story.

That story, like many others of the same period, offers special opportunities to the biographer. It cannot be isolated from the larger events of national history and in some respects it follows familiar and typical lines, as during the years at Cambridge or the performance of the 'grand tour' of Europe; but it is also full of contrasts, marks of original tastes and behaviour, and dramatic, indeed tragic, turns of fortune: Benlowes's fervent Protestantism as against his Catholic upbringing; his life as a wealthy country gentleman, patronizing and cultivating the arts in his Essex retreat, but suffering for his devotion to the Royalist cause; the just and beneficent landowner who was also a poor hand at a business deal, finally overcome and brought to poverty even more by the sharp practice of others than by his own easy-going habits—all these aspects of the theme are depicted simply but with a due sense of their narrative possibilities. If the effect is to make the life of Benlowes seem more interesting than his poetry, few readers of *Theophila* are likely to protest; *Theophila* itself, however, can now be read, if not more easily, at least with better understanding, because of the light which Dr. Jenkins throws on the character of its author and on the intentions it was meant to fulfil. It is clear enough that there was no lack of sincerity behind the moral earnestness and devotional exaltation which this poem so constantly recommends; and no pretentiousness, though plenty of eccentricity, about its form and style.

Students of literature and of book-production in the seventeenth century will be drawn specially to some of these chapters. Possibly the poet's Catholic origins had something to do with his love of meaningful ornament and illustration, of *impresa* and heraldic devices, and possibly also that love was stimulated by his continental tour, for thereafter he gave much thought to the making of illustrated books. His friendship with Phineas Fletcher and Francis Quarles was significant in this respect. It is not difficult, for instance, to believe that the generous hand of Benlowes contributed to the handsome make-up of *The Purple Island* and secured the engravings which some copies contain. These engravings were probably commissioned by him for copies intended as gifts for his friends. His part in Quarles's *Emblems* ('My deare Friend', wrote Quarles, 'You have put the Theorboe into my hand; and I have play'd') was probably not restricted to persuasion. Dr. Jenkins makes it very credible that the expense of the illustrations was at least partly defrayed by him.

Great care was taken over the printing and illustration of *Theophila*, with large and small capitals, roman and italic type all playing their parts in the grading of emphasis, and twenty-five plates prepared for the furthering of instruction and

pleasur  
where i  
in any  
have be

Then  
lists a  
1645 ha  
six year  
correct

Benlow  
his zeal  
decora  
a real  
subject  
informa

The  
author

A Con  
on 6  
Geo

In 1  
servic  
idea th  
wright  
lesser  
'as the  
respec  
*The M*  
the m  
provid  
suppli  
should  
scope  
manu

Ag  
after  
from  
Swift  
Mont  
roug  
that I  
Porto

pleasure by visual aid. A full account is given of these plates in an Appendix, where it is shown that a variously compounded selection of them is usually found in any copy but not the whole number, save where the complementary plates have been inserted in rebinding.

There are several other appendixes on matters of interest to scholars. One lists a number of phrases borrowed by Benlowes from Milton, whose *Poems* of 1645 had time and attractiveness enough to earn this imitative flattery in *Theophila* six years later. The longest of these addenda has to do with the pen-and-ink corrections which some copies of *Theophila* got, apparently from the hand of Benlowes himself, again manifesting a fussiness which was only the excess of his zeal for aesthetic rightness. Both this matter and that of the engravings and decorations are more thoroughly dealt with here than they have been before and a real contribution is thus made by Dr. Jenkins to the bibliography of his subject. It is certain that future editors of Benlowes must take account of the information about the text of his poems which is here made available.

The book is well documented and provided with a valuable index and list of authorities.

L. C. MARTIN

**A Congreve Gallery.** By KATHLEEN M. LYNCH. Pp. xvi+196. 7 illustrations on 6 plates. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press; London: Geoffrey Cumberlege, 1951. \$3.50; 22s. 6d. net.

In her *Social Mode of Restoration Comedy*<sup>1</sup> Professor Lynch, among other services to scholarship, did as much as anyone to disabuse us of the long-standing idea that a breach in the English dramatic tradition divided the Restoration playwrights from the Caroline. At the start of *A Congreve Gallery*, she combats a lesser mistake: the refusal of posterity, down to our own day, to accept Congreve 'as the delightful person in whom his friends rejoiced'. Here and in some other respects her book stands beside Professor John C. Hodges's *William Congreve The Man*,<sup>2</sup> to which credit is justly given in her appraisal, deservedly severe for the most part, of previous writings on Congreve's life. The two books together provide an account of Congreve and his circle that is unlikely to be much supplemented, unless fortune, where systematic research has done all it can, should bring new and perhaps more intimate documents to light. The system and scope of Professor Lynch's research are made plain in her bibliography of manuscript and printed sources.

Against the grudging view of Congreve's personality which came to prevail after his death, her first essay indicates, in a series of impressions skilfully built up from the often small pieces of evidence available, what he meant to Dryden, Swift, Pope, Gay, Addison, Steele, Dennis, Cobham, Lady Mary Wortley Montagu, and the junior Duchess of Marlborough. She prints from Lady Mary's rough draft some fragmentary verses to Congreve's memory, and has discovered that his flame Anne Bracegirdle was sister to Edward Porter's wife Frances (the Porters were first, like Anne, his neighbours, and afterwards had him as lodger

<sup>1</sup> Reviewed in *R.E.S.* iii. (1927), 486.

<sup>2</sup> Reviewed in *R.E.S.* xxiv (1948), 160.

in their house). His enduring affection for his Irish friends Keally, Mein, Luther, Amory, and Robin Fitzgerald, is rightly stressed. Professor Lynch devotes her third essay to Fitzgerald and his family, and her second to Keally.

The forty-odd letters to Keally are the chief exception to our want of informal, intimate papers from Congreve's hand. A study of them and their recipient was published by Professor Lynch in 1938;<sup>1</sup> her present essay makes her findings more accessible, and amplifies them a little. She adds the gist of a letter (28 May 1702) from Keally to Ellis, and of another (10 Oct 1704) to Keally from Mein; gives fresh details of the whereabouts of some that are extant; and for those of Congreve's misdated and misplaced by the editors, furnishes a welcome list of corrections.

The essay on Congreve's mistress, Henrietta, Duchess of Marlborough, is similarly based on an earlier study.<sup>2</sup> Here the amplifications are more extensive. The longest compares with established facts the 'Secret History of Henrada Maria Teresa',<sup>3</sup> which purports to narrate the amour; since Congreve, like the true Courtly Lover, was 'so discret in al', we are obliged to call even the evidence of Wikked-Tunge, though not for more than it is worth. A letter from Henrietta to Jacob Tonson (the younger) is also added, besides references to her by Lord Hervey, the Duchess of Portland, and Swift, with a consideration of two passages in Pope which probably allude to her.

Regarded as 'a Congreve gallery' the book has limitations that Professor Lynch frankly acknowledges. They arise from her materials, to which she is admirably faithful. It is Robin Fitzgerald's family, and Henrietta's relations with her mother, the Duchess Sarah, that can be adequately documented; their relations with Congreve cannot. The subject of the penultimate essay, Henrietta's daughter Mary, though she was almost certainly Congreve's child, seems (according to an anecdote here related) not to have suspected it. Remotest of all from Congreve is the last essay on Dr. Messenger Monsey, who did not become physician to Henrietta's husband, Francis Godolphin, till she and Congreve were both dead. Yet nobody could wish Monsey had been excluded. In Professor Lynch's pages, Godolphin, Henrietta, her two daughters, and her grandson Tom (not to speak of the Duchess Sarah), are none of them without interest even independently of Congreve, but Monsey, who was congratulated when almost ninety on retaining 'all his Witt, and much of his indiscretion', is out and away the liveliest character in the book.

A fine portrait of Monsey is included among the illustrations. Two others, of Henrietta and her daughter Mary, are from originals not reproduced before. The facsimile of a letter from Congreve to Keally is claimed as the first reproduction of any of his letters; and no doubt it is so, if one that appeared in Maggs's Catalogue 275, December 1911, is not to be counted.

Collectors of Shakespeare allusions may like to note two in Congreve's and one in Mrs. Montagu's correspondence, as quoted on pp. 34, 55, and 110. In the first, by an outrageous mispunctuation, Congreve jests on his own plumpness: 'Think

<sup>1</sup> 'Congreve's Irish Friend, Joseph Keally'; *P.M.L.A.* liii (1938), 1076.

<sup>2</sup> 'Henrietta, Duchess of Marlborough'; *P.M.L.A.* lii (1937), 1072.

<sup>3</sup> In *The Court Parrot*, published 23 Nov. 1733.

of me, a  
celebra

August

18s. 1

In re

Dryden

work in

that Po

which t

Jack's c

understa

reading

Dryd

for his

satire w

for prai

and ..

with ep

declare

Such c

Mr.

Absalo

Horace

chapte

freedom

of Mr.

enjoyed

at his h

Comm

sevente

"light

demon

and m

Beac

Mr. Ja

it is w

criticis

do. H

Fleckn

of Dry

hand,

measu

because

of me, as I am nothing extenuate'; in the second, he pitches on perhaps the most celebrated of Falstaff's felicities in *The Merry Wives*.<sup>1</sup> HAROLD F. BROOKS

**Augustan Satire.** By IAN JACK. Pp. x+163. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1952.  
18s. net.

In recent years we have been so preoccupied with the absolute 'greatness' of Dryden and Pope that it comes as a shock when a critic proposes to judge their work in the same spirit that its author writ. 'Are we', asks Mr. Jack, 'to conclude that Pope's major poems do not require interpretation in terms of the kinds in which they were written?' The challenge is pertinent; and so are some of Mr. Jack's other introductory remarks about the discipline necessary for full historical understanding. He himself brings to his study enthusiasm informed by careful reading of contemporary criticism:

Dryden's admiration for Juvenal was another reason for the idiom which he chose for his great satire. Contemporary critics contrasted the 'comical' style of Horatian satire with Juvenal's 'tragic manner'. Juvenalian satire which Dryden singles out for praise—the thoughts 'much more elevated' than those of Horace, the 'sonorous and . . . noble' expressions, and the 'more numerous' verse—proclaims its kinship with epic. It was of this dignified kind of satire that Dryden was thinking when he declared roundly that satire was undoubtedly a species of heroic poetry.

Such criticism, while it stimulates the reader, carries conviction.

Mr. Jack has chosen to examine in detail seven works—*Hudibras*, *MacFlecknoe*, *Absalom and Achitophel*, *The Rape of the Lock*, *The Dunciad*, the *Imitations of Horace*, and *The Vanity of Human Wishes*—to each of which he devotes a separate chapter. This enables him to treat the poems as individual works, and gives freedom to his own enjoyment; for it is one of the most likeable characteristics of Mr. Jack as a critic that to him Augustan poetry is primarily something to be enjoyed, and informed study a means of forwarding that enjoyment. Thus he is at his best with poets whom, I should guess, he likes best—Butler and Dryden. Commenting (apropos of *Hudibras*) that 'in spite of the "kinds"' there was in the seventeenth century no . . . hard and fast distinction between "poetry" . . . and "light verse"' he neatly disposes of an era of critical prejudice, and proceeds to demonstrate, with the especial aid of John Dennis, the subtle varieties of tone and manner to be found in Butler's work.

Because most of us are glad of some assistance when reading *Hudibras* perhaps Mr. Jack's study of this poem is the most practically helpful part of his book; but it is with *MacFlecknoe* and *Absalom and Achitophel* that he achieves his best criticism. Dryden he sees as the artist who achieved superbly what he set out to do. He notes perceptively the development of the figure of Shadwell as *MacFlecknoe* goes on. 'Shadwell is a *creation*, Cibber is not.' It is the majestic stride of Dryden towards his design that delights Mr. Jack. With Pope, on the other hand, a poet who shows no such clarity of intention, he becomes, in some measure, the victim of his own theories. He is happy with *The Rape of the Lock* because of the firm outline: but when he has discovered (fairly enough) that in

<sup>1</sup> III. v. 16. 'For the water swells a man', &c.

*The Dunciad* Pope 'turned his back on the tremendous gain resulting from the consistent following out of the mock heroic idea' his critical concentration seems to desert him; so that, although he makes good points, he does so only intermittently, and at other times, as in his discussion of the almost meaningless term *satura*, he becomes pedestrian.

Dryden's genius lay in carrying out a broad general design; Pope's (even in *The Rape of the Lock*) of recognizing the further possibilities of something he had already written. By neo-classical standards Pope is thus inferior to Dryden, but perhaps this only means that he cannot be fully assessed by those standards. Had Mr. Jack posed the question why (personal animus apart) so perceptive a critic as Dennis should have idolized Dryden and despised Pope he might have been led to some interesting distinctions.

If I closed this book with some feeling of disappointment it was partly because the opening chapters had aroused so much expectation; but I think it was also because the chapters never come together as a whole book. In some ways Mr. Jack's title is a misnomer: this is not a book about Augustan Satire, but about Augustan satires. Individually the chapters are all of interest: collectively it is difficult to be sure what they add up to, and, if one is to judge by the scanty space he devotes to 'conclusions', Mr. Jack may have felt the same. Had he made Dryden his centre-piece he could, without discarding individual appraisals, have shown how other Augustan satire was related to or differed from his, and the book would have gained structurally.

But the only justification for telling an author how he should have written a book is the genuine hope of reading another by him. It is indeed to be hoped that we shall have more from Mr. Jack in this field.

NORMAN CALLAN

**Shenstone's Miscellany 1759-1763.** Now First Edited from the Manuscript  
by IAN A. GORDON. Pp. xx+164. Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1952. 21s. net.

Readers of R.E.S. have already<sup>1</sup> been made acquainted with the Miscellany compiled by Shenstone with the collaboration of his friends, especially of his neighbours in the Midlands, and above all of Thomas Percy, then in his Northamptonshire vicarage. He began to write in a notebook in 1759 and had nearly filled it when he died in 1763. The book was given to Percy and is now in New Zealand. We know from a letter of 1759 that Shenstone had thought to 'amuse' himself 'with the publication of a small Miscellany from neighbour Baskerville's press'. His editor thinks that Percy was 'probably ignorant of his friend's thoughts of publication'. Their close collaboration perhaps makes this unlikely. Shenstone, moreover, had designed a title-page, dated 1759, imitating print in black and red. But it would be like Percy to busy himself at intervals—one note must be later than 1791—with the manuscript, as he busied himself for twenty-five years with his life of Goldsmith.

The Miscellany expands our knowledge of Shenstone's activities on the later volumes of Dodsley's *Collection* and on Percy's own *Reliques*. Though it contains

<sup>1</sup> R.E.S., o.s. xxiii (1947), 43-59.

some verses not hitherto known to have been printed it does not add very much to our knowledge of the 'Warwickshire coterie' or to their reputation. But it is a pleasing memorial to an amiable and ingenious versifier, and we shall all welcome its emergence and publication. Students of Percy as a marginalist will be delighted with Mr. Gordon's footnotes, which distinguish clearly between Shenstone's own notes and Percy's additions. They will commend Percy's pious care of the book. It was 'pitously burned in the fire which consumed my Library at Northumbd. House in 1780'. It was not consumed, but was badly charred at the edges. Percy had it rebound, and was careful to preserve the original endpapers.

When so much is given, with clarity and elegance, it seems churlish to complain. But Mr. Gordon's notes (with no references to the pages of the text) are so interesting that we crave for more.

A few small matters. On the first poem, Mrs. Greville's famous 'Prayer for Indifference' (here called 'Ode to a Fairy'), we might have been told whether the motto (not given in the *Oxford Book of Eighteenth Century Verse*) is hers or Shenstone's, that it is *Heroides* xv. 79, and that Ovid wrote *levibusque cōr est*; not *levibus cōr est*.

The anonymous 'On the Death of Mr. Pelham' (67). The editor identifies the subject as a James Pelham of Crowhurst in Sussex. But 'Esher's mournfull vales' surely point to Henry Pelham the statesman. It was at Esher that 'Kent and Nature vie for Pelham's love'.

'Strawberry-hill' (64). The notes by Shenstone and Percy give the names of most of the houses praised, but leave 'sweet Southcoats' unexplained. It appears from the Yale Walpole (ix. 71, 93) that Walpole admired Sir Edward Southcote's Woburn Farm, near Chertsey.

'Verses on leaving \*\*\*\* in a tempestuous night, March 22, 1758 By Mr. Percy' (8) present a problem of the slightest consequence. The asterisks are Percy's. In Shenstone's index the word was originally A——, which Percy changed to W—— 'remembering that Worcester was the original scene'. Mr. Gordon does not tell us how he knows that. He adds with confidence that A—— was originally Annie (better known as Nancy), that is the Anne whom Percy married in 1759. But the lover of the poem braves the elements to go to, not from, his loved one:

In vain the torrents scorn(?) the shores  
To Delia [Percy's substitution] I must go.

In the last verse

The cheerfull blaze, the social hour,  
The Friend—all plead in vain  
Love calls—I brave each adverse pow'r  
Of Peril and of Pain

which suggests that A—— or W—— was not a place but a man. Perhaps the Anthony Whistler of p. xii?

R. W. CHAPMAN

**Boswell's Life of Johnson together with Boswell's Journal of a Tour to the Hebrides and Johnson's Diary of a Journey into North Wales.** Edited by GEORGE BIRKBECK HILL. Revised and Enlarged Edition by L. F. POWELL. In Six Volumes. Vol. V. *The Tour to the Hebrides and The Journey into North Wales.* Vol. VI. *Index, Table of Anonymous Persons, Bibliography, Errata.* Pp. xxviii+595; x+484. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1950. 63s. net the two volumes.

The first four volumes of Dr. Powell's revision of Hill's *Boswell* appeared in 1936. The last two volumes, impatiently awaited for fourteen years, have brought the edition to a triumphant conclusion. Dr. Powell's work, distinguished as it was in Vols. I-IV, shows to even greater advantage in Vol. V. He was so unlucky as to complete his revision of the first four volumes before the announcement in 1936 of discoveries at Fettercairn House in 1930, and of further discoveries at Malahide Castle in 1937, 1939, and 1948. The papers which came to light in those years would have been of great value to Dr. Powell in the early part of his labours; but for the two works with which he was to deal in Vol. V he had the satisfaction of knowing that the primary documents were already available: the manuscript of *Boswell's Journal* had been found in 1930 and published by Professor F. A. Pottle and Dr. C. H. Bennett in 1936, and the manuscript of Johnson's journal had been in the British Museum for more than 100 years. He has made full and satisfying use of these documents. *Boswell's* manuscript has helped him to correct the received text in several instances and to establish the identity of many persons whose names were prudently omitted in the published narrative, and Johnson's manuscript has enabled him to provide the first satisfactory text of the 'Journey into North Wales', all previous editions deriving from that published by Dupper in 1816.

Dr. Powell's choice of copy-text may cause a little surprise. 'I have adopted the third edition', he writes, 'as the basis of the text, collated it with the first and second editions, and when it is, in my opinion, incorrect, as it frequently is, restored the correct reading and recorded the variants in a critical note.' He also adds that the first edition is 'greatly superior to the other editions in respect of punctuation and the like'. No doubt there were good reasons for adopting this procedure; yet it would seem more logical to correct the first edition by subsequent editions than to correct the third by previous editions, since by this means an editor would be adopting the same procedure as his author and would thus be more certain of eliminating the printer's caprice and of observing and correcting errors which had eluded the author's vigilance when preparing later editions for the press.

Dr. Powell was able to provide substantial additions to Hill's commentary on the *Life*, but his additions to the commentary on the *Tour* are even more numerous. He claims, with justice, that no major character amongst the large number of persons whom Johnson and Boswell met in Scotland has been inadequately commemorated. For these commemorations we are largely indebted not to Hill but to Dr. Powell's own patient and assiduous researches. More striking still is the topographical commentary. Hill had relied mainly on

secondary printed sources; but Dr. Powell has been over the ground himself, and has received notable assistance from a host of local antiquaries. His topographical commentary is a model of its kind, and this applies as much to the notes on Johnson's journal as to those on Boswell's. A solitary slip which appeared in the first draft of this review was deleted when the correction was found anticipated in the errata; it may, however, be mentioned that the 'small Staffordshire town', 'neat and closely built', through which Johnson passed on his way from Shrewsbury to Worcester, is more readily identified by Johnson's spelling (Kinver) than by his commentator's (Kinfare).

The final volume is something more than a mere revision of Hill's index. Though it can be adequately tested only over years of use, it may be said at once that it seems to provide all that the most exacting critics of Hill have asked for. Particularly helpful is the employment of bold type for initials of key-words and for important key-words themselves in the longer articles. An index of persons mentioned anonymously is followed by an interesting and valuable table of anonymous persons. From this table we learn that of these 579 persons 126 still await identification, and since many of these were unknown to Boswell they are likely to remain anonymous. More important for the user of this edition to recognize is that many identifications are established, confirmed, or corrected for the first time in this table.

Here then is the splendid harvest of some twenty-eight years' work. Few editors have as much right as Dr. Powell to feel that they have earned so deep a debt of gratitude from so large a number of readers.

J. B.

**The Life and Activities of Sir John Hawkins.** By PERCY A. SCHOLES. Pp. xiv+287. London: Geoffrey Cumberlege, 1953. 35s. net.

The reviewer who is neither musician nor lawyer, nor even a fisherman, is obliged to take Dr. Scholes's word for much of his account of Sir John, comforting himself with the reflection that this is a review of English studies in a limited sense. But it is clear that he was an energetic and judicious magistrate, and that the vast history of music is in the full sense *rudis indigestaque moles*, of very precious ores. For the rest, Sir John is best known from the satirical comments of his friends and his enemies, and deserves a more candid estimate. His life of Johnson has all the faults that Boswell delighted to point out, yet is a very valuable book. It is also a revealing document; but perhaps it does not reveal its author's most amiable aspect; for a man who retained the friendship of Johnson and Walpole cannot have been wholly repulsive.

Apart from self-revelation, and the bare bones of biography, there is little material for a life except in the three volumes of *anecdotes* or *memoirs* published by the knight's daughter Laetitia Matilda. The reviewer in *The Times Literary Supplement* describes her as 'a sort of blue stocking that had faded in the wash', and deplores Dr. Scholes's long quotations from her books. Opinions will differ. Miss Hawkins is a copious and perhaps fairly reliable source, and as such is unique. Dr. Scholes is occasionally betrayed into irrelevance, but most of the extracts are to the point, and I find them entertaining.

It is less than fair to base Johnson's opinion of Hawkins solely on the humorous denunciation reported by Fanny Burney—and here quoted three times. Johnson's few letters to him are friendly, and writing to others he described him as 'a man of very diligent enquiry and very wide intelligence', his edition of Walton's *Angler* as 'very elegantly composed'. Nearing his end, he wrote to Hawkins begging 'the consolation of your company'. Dr. Scholes rightly rejects (p. 186) the view that the two men 'were never really intimate'.

Appendices include a bibliography of the family—for both the sons were authors—letters from Hawkins to Percy and from Burney on his rival's *History*, a catch on the two *Histories* in which the collocation of 'Sir John Hawkins' and 'Burney's History' was intended to suggest 'Burn' is History!', and finally an elaborate description by Dr. L. F. Powell of a Bodleian manuscript recently unearthed by Professor J. L. Clifford. This adds a number of pieces to the Hawkins canon, and shows him in the unexpected role of an imitator of Donne.

This book hardly compares in importance with *The Great Dr. Burney* (which embraces 'all the dear Burneys, little and great'). But it has the qualities the author's books have taught us to expect. When Johnson heard the conflict between the two great histories of music deplored as unhappy, he robustly maintained that on the contrary they would sell each other. Certainly these two lives complement each other, to the satisfaction of musicologists, Johnsonians, and others.

R. W. CHAPMAN

**Robert Burns.** By DAVID DAICHES. Pp. viii+376. London: G. Bell & Sons, 1952. 15s. net.

Dr. Daiches's object has been to provide the general reader with a book about Burns which avoids sentimentality and aims at a higher degree of critical discrimination than is to be found in most popular books about his life and poems. He does not attempt to rival Dr. Snyder's admirable biography: his scope is closer to that of Hans Hecht's *Robert Burns: The Man and his Work*, but he devotes a higher proportion of his space to criticism. He has therefore three subjects to deal with: the poems themselves; the life of the poet; and the literary and social background which form the context of his life and work.

When he deals with the milieu of Burns Dr. Daiches is obviously writing on a subject in which he is keenly interested. The introductory chapter on 'The Scottish Literary Tradition' is interesting and provocative, though inevitably a little sketchy. Here and elsewhere Dr. Daiches reveals a wider range of knowledge than that of many writers on Burns, and makes some illuminating comparisons. The cleavage in the Scots tradition of which the Union of the Parliaments was at once a cause and an effect is prominent in the background of his picture.

Perhaps it is because the book was originally written for an American public (it was published in America several years ago) that Dr. Daiches felt obliged to fill in the biographical background more fully than he might otherwise have done. On the whole he has made a good job of the difficult task of describing again events which have often been described before. Sir Walter Raleigh described the

life of Burns as 'a perfectly devised trap for the superior person', but Dr. Daiches has managed to deal with the poet's love adventures without either salacity or dishonesty. His biographical information is everywhere up to date, and he uses generous quotations from the letters to give vividness to his narrative.

In the critical part of his book Dr. Daiches keeps constantly in mind such general questions as the difference between Burns's use of Scots and English and the nature of his relation to the earlier Scots poetic tradition, but concentrates on quoting from the poems and providing an expository and critical commentary. He quotes a great deal (indeed his book must contain almost as many lines of verse as the Kilmarnock edition itself), and his comments are usually shrewd and persuasive (although his remark that in 'John Anderson my Jo' Burns 'avoids sentimentality' is hard to accept). But in this part of the book readers who know how acute a critic Dr. Daiches can be may feel a trifle frustrated. He seems to be writing for an audience which will not venture on the hazardous experience of reading a poem without a guide at hand to point out the principal attractions and excuse the weaker features of the landscape. While a better guide could hardly be found, a closer analysis of a smaller number of poems might have been more rewarding.

The statement of an earlier reviewer that this is 'the best all-round . . . guide-book' to Burns may be accepted, with the reservations which such a description implies. The dust-cover informs us that the author is engaged on an extended study of Scottish literature in the eighteenth century. That is good news, for Dr. Daiches has the historical and sociological interests without which an important book on this difficult and neglected subject could hardly be written. Perhaps it is permissible to hope that in this larger study Dr. Daiches will free himself from the handicap of writing for a very large audience and give us the searching study for which he is so well equipped.

IAN JACK

**The Poetical Works of William Wordsworth. Poems Founded on the Affections. Poems on the Naming of Places. Poems of the Fancy. Poems of the Imagination.** Edited from the manuscripts with textual and critical notes by E. DE SELINCOURT. 2nd edition [revised by HELEN DARBI-SHIRE]. Pp. xii+548. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1952. 30s. net.

In her prefatory note to the revised edition of the second volume of *The Poetical Works of William Wordsworth*, Miss Darbishire says that she has taken the opportunity 'to correct some textual and other errors and omissions in the volume issued in 1944 and to add in an Appendix . . . an account of a transcript, made by Sara Hutchinson, of very interesting drafts of a number of Wordsworth's poems composed in the first six months of 1802, the majority of which appear in this volume. . . . Some of the other poems transcribed appear in Vols. I, III, and IV of the present edition. . . . The notebook was known in the family as "Sara Hutchinson's Poets". It now belongs to Miss Joanna Hutchinson' who has allowed it to be used by the editor. The transcripts afford most interesting evidence of Wordsworth's poetic development and of his 'move forward' 'in the spring of 1802 from the matter-of-fact descriptive style of the *Lyrical Ballads*

. . . to the freer imaginative art' of the 1807 volumes. This advance is perhaps best illustrated by the changes made in 'The Leech Gatherer'. Miss Darbishire reprints his letter of rebuke to Sara for her failure to understand his main intention in writing the poem, of which she had read (and, as it now appears, copied) the first draft. The letter was written on 14 June 1802 and contains quotations from the original version. By 4 July, as is recorded in Dorothy's *Journal*, the poet had completed his revision of the text and, as the printed version shows, had digested and profited by the criticisms he at first found so unpalatable. Miss Darbishire records (and in part reconstructs) the variants, which fully justify her opinion of the unfolding of the poet's imaginative power at this period of his life.

The alterations made in the other poems are less striking, but they bear out the view of his growth and of the development of his critical faculty, for example the substitution in 'Repentance', l. 2 (p. 46) of 'Those beautiful fields, the delight of the day' for 'Half a dozen snug fields, fat, contented and gay'.

The discovery and analysis of Sara's notebook thus adds to the value of this great standard edition of Wordsworth's poetry.

EDITH J. MORLEY

**The Buried Life. A Study of the Relation between Thackeray's Fiction and his Personal History.** By GORDON N. RAY. Pp. vi+148. London: Geoffrey Cumberlege, for the Royal Society of Literature, 1952. 12s. 6d. net.

Professor Gordon Ray's book is an extension of his Lowell lectures for 1950 and a by-product of work towards a comprehensive life of Thackeray, on which he has been engaged since 1946, when the last volumes of his magnificent edition of the *Letters and Private Papers* appeared. Now that we are moving year by year past the centenaries of Thackeray's novels, his reputation can lie in no safer hands than those of Professor Ray, for they are skilled, bold, and compassionate and, though they cut deep, they intend the restoration of health to their subject.

The quantity of new biographical material in this book would be sufficiently interesting in itself, but it is held throughout in closest relation to an inquiry into the nature of the creative process in Thackeray. While investigating his family background, Professor Ray has become increasingly aware of 'the extent to which his imaginative life was dependent for sustenance on the persons who figured most intimately in his personal history'. In some degree this was already known, and some of the identifications were acknowledged by Thackeray himself, but the present study not only adds three new prototypes but enters more profoundly into the nature of an art so conditioned than any preceding critic has done.

The three new originals are Thackeray's maternal grandmother, Mrs. Butler, his cousin, George Trant Shakespear, and his wife's uncle, Lt.-Colonel Merrick Shawe, who gave their substance to Miss Crawley, Jos Sedley, and Major Pendennis. There is nothing doubtful about these identifications: they are certified by a rich correspondence of detail from sources hitherto untapped or inaccessible, while Mrs. Butler clinches her own case by adopting, in the signature

to a letter, the Christian names of her double. She was the only one of the three still alive when her portrait was taken, and Thackeray's relationship with her, as with his cousin and his uncle by marriage, was not close enough to trouble his detachment. The characters are consistent, harmonious in presentation, and completely successful, but less profound, Professor Ray thinks, than the much-criticized characters of Thackeray's good women, Amelia Sedley, Helen Pendennis, and Lady Castlewood. Here the circumstances were quite different. His 'emotional allegiance' to the three women who stood for these portraits—his wife, his mother, and Jane Brookfield—was of cardinal importance in his life; it was compounded with much painfulness, and it was still subsisting. His mother was living with him when he embodied her as Helen Pendennis and was 'mighty angry' at some of the delineating strokes. Even though they developed their own fictitious careers, these characters remain tethered to their originals by the heart-strings of the author. Thus the mature and rather bitter penetration that perceived and judged Helen's narrowness and injustice, her jealousy and maternal possessiveness, was yoked to the memory of a lonely, mishandled child's passionate adherence to his beautiful mother, his gratitude for her protection, and his sense of her purity and warmth in a brutal world; or, to take a similar example, the boy's hero-worship of his stepfather had to make terms with the 'exasperated resignation' that colours some of Thackeray's references to Colonel Newcome. This is the cause, and not a cynical lip-service to Victorian ethical ideals, that accounts for the inconsistency of these characters with what their author says about them. The modes are not so much confused as juxtaposed. Even as he dissects the vanities of the gods of his hearth, it is borne in upon him that here alone, in the whole Fair, can he hope for warmth and shelter, and he hastens to excuse, approve, and bless. His testimony is conflicting, as it arises from one or the other part of his experience, but it is unbribed; and Professor Ray makes an exceedingly good point when he says that it is the sharp fidelity with which Thackeray reports Amelia's words and actions that arouses his reader to so acute a sense of dissatisfaction with his comments upon them.

We must not therefore expect from a writer whose 'novels turn out to afford a kind of diary of his intimate life' the dispassionate vision that becomes possible when experience is mastered by time. Where Thackeray is most penetrating he is at the same time most deeply engaged himself, and we must accept the penetration together with the disturbance that stimulated and accompanied it. He comes nearest to achieving the balance of detachment and sympathy in *Esmond*. The biographical approach sheds keen light on this puzzling book, written just after he had finally broken with Jane Brookfield and steeped in a 'cut-throat melancholy, suited to my state', and the Esmond–Lady Castlewood scenes appear at times as a reflection, at times as an inversion or reversal of the relations between them. But, close as he is to the events on which he builds, he is cut off from them and the people in them, and thereby able to focus their ideal equivalents more steadily. There is greater harmony of effect in Lady Castlewood than there is in Amelia or Helen Pendennis.

It is a great pleasure to read Professor Ray's temperate, acute, and sympathetic statement of Thackeray's case. There are also other pleasures in his book,

enlivening challenges of contemporary critical orthodoxy and sidelights from other novelists, on which this reviewer has no space to comment. In tackling Thackeray's sentimentalism he has addressed himself to the biggest obstacle in the way of the novelist's return to favour, and by defining its nature, origin, and characteristic functioning and relating it to that 'buried life', from which grew also his greatest strength and authority, he has sought to reduce its repellent force for modern readers. At least we may say that, if it still lies in our path, we can now see round it.

J. M. S. TOMPKINS

**The Ballad Tree: A Study of British and American Ballads, their Folklore, Verse, and Music.** Together with Sixty Traditional Ballads and their Tunes. By EVELYN KENDRICK WELLS. Pp. x+370. New York: The Ronald Press Co., 1950; London: Methuen, 1951. \$4.50; 36s. net.

A student of folk-song may approach it in three ways. He may collect what he has heard recited or sung, as Child did, or follow a line of historical research, like Joseph Hunter and more recent writers on the Robin Hood cycle, or he may attempt literary analysis and criticism, like the late W. J. Entwistle in his remarkable *European Balladry*. Professor Wells has combined all three approaches. She has included the texts of many ballads as they were sung to her in America and an anthology from other collections, a chapter on the origins of the Robin Hood ballads, and a critical survey extended over selected areas, with biographies of Child and Sharp for good measure.

The versions that Professor Wells has collected herself are interesting, though they do not all deserve to appear in a work of literary criticism. In the version of 'Lord Thomas and Fair Annet' (pp. 106-7), taken down from the children of a Kentucky school, the words have largely lost their taste and evocative power. A reader unacquainted with the ballad might not have realized this, had not Professor Wells quoted some twenty pages earlier several stanzas of the rich old Scots version. This is unfortunately not the only case in which she has printed a text and then quoted elsewhere, for critical purposes, stanzas that do not appear in it. 'Mary Hamilton' is another. For this, the author has chosen the short English version from an American anthology. Later on she announces:

Mary Hamilton's story bursts in a breath from the first line:

Word's gane to the kitchen  
And word's gane to the ha' . . . ;

but turning back to the text, the reader finds that, on the contrary, her story opens with quiet tragedy:

Last night there were four Maries.

The chapter on the Robin Hood ballads summarizes much that has been written by others, but does not add anything new. Preoccupation with these rather familiar theories has led to a neglect of other subjects. Of 'Earl Brand', the famous ballad that Entwistle traced back to the Eddic *Helgakviða* and forward to the Appalachians, Professor Wells gives only a version sung to her in Kentucky, called 'Sweet William and Fair Ellen', adding a few scattered comments on it in

her survey. This would be interesting to find in an anthology of ballads as they are sung in America, but in a literary survey it is not enough.

There are other defects besides lack of balance. In the chapter on theories of origin we read on the first page: 'A try at dancing a ballad soon shows the difficulties, though the Norwegians say it is possible.' The Faroese have been demonstrating that it is possible for 700 years, and in English alone both Entwistle (whose book is named in the bibliography) and E. M. Smith-Dampier have given us full information.

Professor Wells properly includes and discusses musical texts. 'Neither Percy nor Ritson', she says (p. 234 n.), 'had much interest in traditional song; both worked from manuscripts and broadsides.' It is debatable whether a ballad taken down from a singer, say in 1765, has more validity than one published by an earlier collector. Even if it has, *The Ballad Tree* by no means convinces one that it is wise to draw one's texts from the nearest fount of 'traditional song'. Compare the melody of 'The Merry Golden Tree' given by Professor Wells with Sharp's Somerset version. It is misleading to write a chapter on the characteristics of folk-tunes and deprive many of the examples of their best-known and loveliest melodies.

The reviewer considers that the many attempts at literary criticism of traditional folk-poetry and song are enough to show that it is an impossible task. Professor Wells evidently disagrees for she quotes (p. 255) the remark of Child: 'the Scot loves his ballads but is incurious about them'. The wonder of the Scottish ballad heritage is reflected in *The Ballad Tree*, and of course it is only the half of it; Gaelic folk poetry is unmentioned. And if the Scots who have loved and preserved such a heritage have been 'incurious' about it, does that not suggest that there may be something superfluous about such curiosity? But to those who have curiosity and insist on satisfying it, this book is to be recommended. It is written with charm, and the descriptions of selected areas and times in which the ballad has thriven are delightful. The picture of life in the 'ballad' areas of America is of the greatest interest, although the reviewer suspects that a somewhat strict definition of her subject has prevented the author from discussing the wider range of songs of the south-west. What he would have enjoyed most from Professor Wells would have been the whole gathered harvest of her own country's folk poetry and song.

IAN GRIMBLE

**Studies in Bibliography. Vol. IV, 1951-2.** Edited by FREDSON BOWERS.

Pp. 237. Charlottesville: Bibliographical Society of the University of Virginia; London: Bernard Quaritch, 1951. \$6.00.

This volume maintains the high standard that we have come to expect from these Studies, now annually issued from the Bibliographical Society of the University of Virginia. Like the previous volume it contains important papers which were read before the English Institute in New York and interest continues to be centred on problems connected with Shakespeare and books printed in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. But the articles range widely from Curt Bühler's observations on the 1483 Ratdolt edition of the *Fasciculus Temporum* to

Ralph Green's account of early American power printing-presses. And there are further excursions of a special kind such as the attempt to date Milton's notes on Machiavelli's *Discorsi* by a study of the handwriting of his amanuenses, the analysis of the manuscripts of Chaucer's *Lak of Stedfastnesse*, and the examination of the manuscripts of the Commentary of Servus Danielis on *Aeneid* III-IV.

G. I. Duthie has some ingenious suggestions of the way in which he supposes the copy of Q2 *Romeo and Juliet* was prepared, and very cautiously and tentatively suggests what he imagines may have been the scribe's procedure—at what points he transcribes from a manuscript and at what points he makes use of leaves from his copy of Q1, corrected in the margin. The reader must beware of a curious trick in his method of persuasion in which we are led on with the utmost care through possibilities and probabilities, with due signs of warning—nevertheless when he has reached a conclusion as a result of this series of conjectures, he is inclined then to state it as an established fact, e.g. 'Just as on one occasion when he was correcting Q1 Scribe E put in a reading (puffing) which was in fact a memorial transcription, so I believe he did on one occasion when he was transcribing the Shakespearian manuscript.'

Giles Dawson gives an account of the reprinting of probably some twenty-five sheets of the Fourth Folio, presumably owing to their having been under-printed in 1685, these reprinted sheets being clearly marked by the absence of side rules and the horizontal foot rule.

James G. McManaway has provided in his bibliographical notes on Daniel's *Civil Wars* some necessary preliminary investigation and has indicated what must be done further by an editor of the poem. He has suggested an explanation for the two title-pages, with different compartments at the top, and has drawn attention to the three different founts of type and different measures used in (a) The First Four Books, (b) the 'fift' book, and (c) the 'fyft' book, and suggests that (b) and (c) were printed not by Peter Short but by John Windet and James Roberts respectively. If he is right, and the fifth book was produced after a long delay, there are as he points out some interesting problems for an editor to consider and for the critic who would be concerned with the development in Daniel's thought and style during the last years of the century.

Of great general interest to all bibliographers are the contributions of Allan H. Stevenson concerning watermarks. From his knowledge of the varied sources of imported paper he has reminded us of the way in which stocks of paper were drawn from different paper-mills and tended to become mixed up together by the time they had reached the shelves of the printer. This would be enough to account for the great variety of paper found in a single volume. But in pointing out that all watermarks are 'twins', owing to the practice of using moulds made in pairs, which naturally vary in position with relation to the chain-lines or in details of design, he has shown that the statement that 'This copy has the same watermark throughout' is almost inevitably wrong. He has further indicated ten points of difference to be looked for in comparing such twin watermarks, very useful to increase the accuracy of our observation and notation of them, even though we may well be disturbed at the horrible possibilities of having to insert another complicated formula into our bibliographical descriptions. He adds a

further note in this volume on his discovery of two isolated examples of pot watermarks, dated respectively 1608 and 1617, in the Church-Huntington copies of *Sir John Oldcastle*, dated '1600' and *Henry V*, dated '1608', two of the famous quartos of 1619.

The paper by William Todd on 'Bibliography and the Editorial Problem in the Eighteenth Century' suggests that there is a vast territory stocked with game waiting for the bibliographical hunters and their new weapons. He insists that we should not forget the rapid development of the printing business in the latter part of the century, and some of the instances he gives almost justify his use of the term 'mass production' as applied to the number of impressions even of large books, made from type kept standing for many months. He shows how much work remains to be done in differentiating more carefully between these numerous reprints, and in examining more closely the press-work by the study of press figures, in so far as we can follow the different ways in which they were used. He suggests another very profitable method, applicable to the latter part of the century, by which the earliest state of a text may be checked by reference to passages cited in the literary reviews; the extent to which this may be done is indicated by the example quoted of *Humphrey Clinker*, of which no less than seventy-four pages were reprinted in four different journals.

H. Teerink has discovered some unnoticed earlier editions of *The Verses on the Death of Dr. Swift*, supposedly issued in 1736 with J. Witford's pirated editions of Pope's *Essay on Man*. He gives a list of variants which shows that these 'piracies' must have been printed from the same version of the poem as published by Bathurst in folio in 1739, containing the omissions and additions to Swift's text for which King and Pope were responsible. It seems pretty clear, therefore, that they are not earlier editions at all, but piracies made from the Bathurst edition, with the date deliberately falsified.

The volume contains many other valuable Notes and a very full Check List of bibliographical scholarship for 1950.

HERBERT DAVIS

**Annual Bibliography of English Language and Literature. Vol. XXII, 1941.** Edited for the Modern Humanities Research Association by ANGUS MACDONALD and LESLIE N. BROUGHTON. Pp. xvi+235. **Vol. XXIII, 1942.** Edited . . . by ANGUS MACDONALD and HENRY J. PETTIT, JR. Pp. xvi+154. Cambridge: University Press, 1952. 21s. and 25s. net. respectively.

It is easy to take the regular appearance of an annual bibliography for granted and use it without sense of obligation to the compilers, but reflection calls to mind the laborious processes of making one, and the responsibilities that such an undertaking imposes. The generous and devoted service of the editors of *The Annual Bibliography* deserves attention, and all the more at present, when the need to recover ground lost because of the war must have added to their formidable task a painful sense of its urgency. No one will envy them the prospect of the work ahead or the consciousness that as they collect the publications of past years those of the present do not cease to multiply. English scholars are under a considerable obligation to the editors and indexer of these two volumes.

*The Annual Bibliography* for 1941 and 1942 retains its familiar character as a useful instrument of scholarship. The nature of its contents in certain parts does, however, suggest that some accommodation might profitably be made to changing circumstances, and that the editorial policy about classification ought to be reviewed. Material in the sections on 'Ancillary Studies', 'The Nineteenth Century', and 'The Twentieth Century' is at times a startling mixture; the relevance of many entries would be more quickly apparent if the contents of these sections could be classified by subject as English or American. Such classification has been applied with advantage in the section on General Language; it seems the most practical solution to a difficulty that will probably not diminish. Further subdivision would make this important book of reference more efficient.

In the volumes under consideration there are several anomalies of classification: 1941.3667 "The Canterbury Tales" and the "Decameron" which appears in XXI 'Comparative Literature' ought also to be noticed in the Chaucer section despite the absence of his name from its title; and 1941.3740, 'Provençal Elements in the English Vernacular Lyrics of Manuscript Harley 2253' will certainly interest Middle English scholars as much as students of comparative literature. Perhaps the omission of these two items from the Middle English section was an oversight. As a rule material capable of two classifications is entered twice and joined by cross-reference. A few instances where cross-reference is not given may be noticed: in the 1941 volume: 336 and 598; 10 and 1009; 952 and 2455; 982 and 2487; 966 and 2507; in the 1942 volume: 425 and 1392; 409 and 2251; 2348 and 2366. The usual manner of reference is from the later to the earlier entry of an item, but there are occasional references from the earlier to the later, such as in the 1941 volume at 1410, 1451, 1494, 1506, 1527, 1772, 1978, 2110, 2177; and in the 1942 volume at 1459, 1532, 1534 (the same item as 1532), 1770, and 1773. It is not clear whether this somewhat confusing departure from the usual practice is a deliberate change in presentation or merely reflects which card was made first. There are also at least two cases where the presence of an item in the previous year's bibliography is not noticed: thus 1942.621 is also 1941.1035, and 1942.698 is 1941.1151.

Except for the omissions from the Middle English section these are slight blemishes and scarcely diminish the usefulness of the bibliographies. In view of the pressure of work upon the editors their number seems small. The same is true of the printer's errors. 1941.1277, 'Ovservation', 1941.1971 'Hstory', 1941.1494 'Johnson's *Every Man in His Humour*', or 1941 page 211, where item 2709 follows 3708, will not mislead anyone. 1942.2136 'De Veto' should read 'De Voto', and 1942.2251 'Nugh' should read 'Nuuh'.

Responsibility for such mechanical detail is well known to be exhausting. The amount of it in the material still confronting the editors must be immense. Presumably the quantity of publication during the remaining war years was small, but to cover those years is rapidly becoming the least part of any project of bringing *The Annual Bibliography* up to date. If it were possible henceforward to bring out two volumes a year, the lost ground would still not be recovered much before 1962. These are sober thoughts. Whatever the policy of the

editors  
them v

A His  
K. A  
Pp.  
Cur  
This  
schola  
Litera  
previo  
studen  
not ye  
gradua  
do no  
thought  
provid  
lectua  
payin  
each

The  
agreem  
Any i  
might  
trainin  
first t

Ole  
His f  
between  
humani  
Old E  
glorior  
Saxon  
Englis  
the p  
autho  
notes  
includ  
the N  
but i  
Angli  
and I  
surve  
ratho

editors of *The Annual Bibliography* one cannot fail, in the circumstances, to wish them well in their continuation.

GEORGE KANE

**A History of English Literature.** HARDIN CRAIG, General Editor. By GEORGE K. ANDERSON, HARDIN CRAIG, LOUIS I. BREDVOLD, and JOSEPH WARREN BEACH. Pp. xiv+697. New York: Oxford University Press, 1950; London: Geoffrey Cumberlege, 1951. \$8.00; 48s. net.

This large and well-produced volume, the work of four eminent American scholars, is one of the most interesting and informative histories of English Literature ever published. Saintsbury's *Short History* assumes considerable previous knowledge and is indeed often dull and incomprehensible to young students advised to read it during their first university years. His style was not yet at its best in 1898, and his wisdom and humour become apparent only gradually as knowledge grows. Legouis and Cazamian are easier to read, but they do not strike so deep, and George Sampson's summary of the Cambridge History, though urbane and charming, suffers by being an abridgement. The new work provides a fuller survey than these, paying more attention to the social and intellectual environment, giving more personal and bibliographical data, and, while paying special note to the major authors, traces the chief literary forms within each of the four periods into which the study is divided.

The Preface states that 'no attempt was made by the authors to secure general agreement on any matters except form, areas to be covered, and space allotted'. Any integration was left to chance, or (more correctly) to the syntheses which might coincide 'in the minds of earnest and competent students' of similar training. Actually, although there are differences of emphasis and style, the first three parts are not dissimilar in approach.

Old and Middle English Literature are handled by Professor G. K. Anderson. His first paragraph excites anxiety by describing the Middle Ages as a bridge between classical and modern times rather than as an independent region of human life. The weak image is, however, soon rectified by a clear account of Old English society, though he looks down on it as 'ignorant, intolerant and gloriously unwashed', and regrets that the imperfect records show the Anglo-Saxon as 'apparently clod-like'. Yet he realizes the 'mass and power' of Old English literature, though Church domination kept it static. He doubts whether the patterns of stress and alliterations in the poetry were as deliberate as some authorities have argued. An excellent account of early heroic poetry, with useful notes on extant manuscripts, precedes a summary of other verse and prose, including Anglo-Latin literature and didactic and 'informational' writing before the Norman Conquest. Middle English literature is put into its historical setting, but more should have been made of linguistic problems. The importance of Anglo-French and Latin writings is shown, and such men as Giraldus Cambrensis and Robert Grosseteste are brought to life. The romances are quite brilliantly surveyed, and other medieval tales. Professor Anderson follows Louise Pound rather than Kittredge and Child on the Ballads. His account of *Piers Plowman*,

its various manuscripts and its allegory, is admirable. The whole section makes a valuable introduction to medieval literature and its problems.

Professor Hardin Craig writes easily on the Renaissance, paying more attention than Saintsbury to the cultural relations of literature, e.g. the influence on the Reformation as shown in controversy, and the new intellectual ferment. His method is to trace the history of particular forms briefly so as to bring out the individual contributions of the chief authors, who are competently if sometimes conventionally handled. More might have been said of Marlowe's and Lyly's influence. The Shakespeare section is competent, but one misses any clear line of imaginative growth in the judicious remarks on specific plays. More than half the five pages on the Elizabethan sonnet are devoted to Shakespeare. Minor lyrists get brief mention, and there are useful pages on the diverse types of prose. On the whole post-Shakespearian drama receives more satisfactory treatment than the earlier theatre. Curiously, Herrick receives more notice than Donne. Bacon and Milton are particularly well treated, but the paragraphs on Marvell are surprisingly superficial. The General Editor had a difficult assignment, but he fails to give any pervasive sense of literary development.

Professor L. I. Bredvold on the Restoration and eighteenth century traces the line of wit, the transfer from courtly to bourgeois attitudes. He shows the importance of 'Nature', but might have made more of the influence of Hobbes and Locke on literary ideas. The Augustan satirists are admirably handled, and the sensibility of the eighteenth century is discriminated and related to social and intellectual changes. It is strange to see Sheridan, Reynolds, and Crabbe grouped together because they were members of the Johnson circle. Cowper is seen in the light of the Evangelical Revival. Blake, however, is kept in isolation.

Professor J. W. Beach, who takes the period between 1798 and the First World War, is the only member of the team to begin by defining his purpose. His aim is to give prominence to significant figures, i.e. those 'broadly and deeply representative of the human spirit within the conditions of aesthetic expression'. He obviously regrets that his task involves 'too much of the brute matter of history' to allow 'a reasoned aesthetic of literature'; but he comments on some tendencies of modern criticism, the pejorative use of 'Romantic' and 'Victorian', the assertion that Victorian writers wrote discursively 'with an overlaying of poetical ornament', &c. He admires the practical achievements of the 'new criticism', while regretting its rigidity. His own treatment of the nineteenth century is in part a reply to its denigrators, finding their fashionable paradoxes in the Romantic poets, in Wordsworth nature and spirit, in Shelley necessity and will, in Byron personal passion and social reason. Coleridge's poetry is not so well treated. Lamb, Hazlitt, and De Quincey are linked as 'eccentrics', and Landor is related to other writers of Imaginary Conversations. There are valuable chapters on the literature of science, history, and politics. As might have been expected Professor Beach is masterly on the ethical attitudes of the novelists. Tennyson and Browning and Hardy are judged mainly as writers on current intellectual themes, Morris and Swinburne as escapist producing museum pieces (here his customary freshness flags). Like Saintsbury, Professor Beach pauses now and then to survey the field he has covered. Of the four authors he is the one most aware of the past in the

present and the unity of his period. In this respect he had, of course, the easiest task, but the result is that his section is the most original. Whereas the others are intent on providing an elementary textbook with plenty of facts and anecdotes, he seeks, even where he is not able to find, a comprehensive view at once social and aesthetic.

The volume, with its considerable Bibliography, will be of great service to students, teachers, and the general reader, for it contains much of value for everybody and is a mine of information and succinct judgements. It should be in every school and college library. One reads it with gratitude, yet lays it down with regret that the four authors did not come together and agree on some unifying conception wherein to assimilate their wealth of detail. As Professor J. Isaacs said in a recent inaugural lecture, we lack any adequate philosophic history of English Literature. The publication of large-scale histories of a piecemeal nature is not conducive to the requisite imaginative, encyclopaedic attitude. England and America have as yet no De Sanctis, not even a Taine.

G. BULLOUGH

### SHORT NOTICES

**The Mirror of Love: A Reinterpretation of *The Romance of the Rose*.** By ALAN M. F. GUNN. Pp. xvi+592. Lubbock, Texas: Texas Tech. Press.

\$5.25.

'Reinterpretation' is a bold claim to make, and 'Mirror of Love' (apparently a mistranslation of 'Le mirouer aux amoureus' of Jean de Meung) a pretentious title. Over 600 pages is a very long book, and if the footnotes, printed so small that they can hardly be read without a magnifying glass, had been in the same type as the text, there would have been at least twice as many. Mr. Gunn has been ill served by his advisers, who seem to have concentrated on telling him what to put in instead of indicating what he could leave out. His footnotes usually consist of lengthy explanations of what he does not mean, or of wearisome analyses of well-known books. Most, if not all, that is of permanent value in this study could have been included in a couple of articles called something like 'A Justification of Jean de Meung'.

It is a pity that Mr. Gunn has thrown so many obstacles in the way of reading his book, for it is to be feared that what is valuable in it may be overlooked. No one should omit to read the appendix (only fourteen pages) in which Mr. Gunn, with amazing patience and industry, has analysed the Figures of Amplification in the Romance. Recent writers, in particular M. Gorce and M. Paré, have emphasized the scholastic method of Jean de Meung. It is curious that no one has said before in so many words that the framework of the poem is a disputation. The importance of this, which has partly gone unrecognized because it does not really matter very much, is that Jean can be shown to have had a plan, and his so-called digressions belong to the structure. Thus Jean is vindicated as an author, though aesthetically speaking the digressions remain digressions. So, what we have here is not a reinterpretation, but a fresh interpretation. Mr. Gunn himself recognizes the fact that a medieval allegory is intended to have several interpretations, and none of them has any peculiar sanctity.

M. DOMINICA LEGGE

**Early Middle English Texts.** Edited by BRUCE DICKINS and R. M. WILSON. Pp. xvi+335. Cambridge: Bowes & Bowes, 1951. 15s. net.

The publication of this pleasantly got-up volume has solved one problem of the harassed lecturer in Middle English, who has hitherto been forced, in dealing with material earlier than 1300, either to use a selection now out of print or too detailed for the ordinary student, or to recommend a selection edited in a foreign language.

This work follows the normal run of such selections, comprising a bibliography (with two and a half blank pages for additions), thirty-eight selections, a detailed—and perhaps occasionally controversial—section on the Characteristics of Early Middle English, notes, many of an historical or a semantic nature, on the texts, and a very full glossary.

The editors point out that this is not an anthology, though it does give students a good idea of the scope of early Middle English literature. One cannot therefore protest too much about the exclusion of one's own favourites, though one may regret them. But teaching experience has suggested that some of the selections (e.g. that from *King Horn*) might with advantage have been longer, and some protests have been made about the inclusion of the particular *Ancren Wisse* passage.

All editors are fallible, and it is therefore in no mood of carping criticism that attention is drawn to a few shortcomings in this work. 1. *Bibliography*. There is a later edition of Baugh's *History of the English Language*; and as to Ker's *English Literature, Medieval*, reference might have been made to the reset edition of 1945, with the Supplementary Note by R. W. Chambers. 2. *Texts*. p. 11, l. 30: for *neuer—more* read *neuermore*: p. 56, ll. 177-80: the interpretation of this passage needs attention; p. 58, footnote: for *Lore* read *Lore*; p. 60, l. 68 and note on *felen*: in Scots, of course, one can still 'feel a smell'; p. 81, l. 26: the punctuation here has gone wrong. 3. *Notes*. p. 194, l. 265: this note needs tidying up; p. 207, l. 57: for *cleſt* read *cleſt*; p. 212, l. 42: one would have liked a reference to 'mice and rats and such small deer' in *King Lear*; p. 217, l. 13: one wonders whether the use of *thane* in Scots is really as stated there, and, of course, in the *O.E.D.* It seems to have been used in the first place as an equivalent to the Celtic *mormaer*, but it seems also doubtful whether it figured in documents, as distinct from the works of historians, later than the fourteenth century. 4. *Glossary*. A few points of minor importance have been noted, such as the correspondence of the contractions for *Swedish* and *South-West(ern)*, and the double entry under *an<sup>s</sup>*.

A. MACDONALD

**Shakespeare : N.B.L. Book List, Second Series.** General Editor, KATHARINE J. WORTH. Pp. 32. London: Cambridge University Press, for the National Book League, 1952. 1s. 6d. net.

In planning and selection this booklet is excellent; in detail of execution it needs a thorough overhaul. The chief fault is chaotic dating. The aim is to give the date 'of the latest revised editions'. As a principle this is not entirely satisfactory. The reader ought to be told, for instance, that Greg's *Editorial Problem* was first published in 1942, and the disadvantages are still more obvious when Boas's *Shakspere and his Predecessors* (originally 1896) is dated 1939, and thus placed in the wrong section. But the principle, such as it is, is not properly carried out. Thus, while *The Wheel of Fire* is dated 1949, *The Imperial Theme* and *The Shakespearean Tempest* appear as 1931 and 1932, though with the publisher and price of the new editions. *What Happens in Hamlet* is dated 1937 instead of 1951. More often, the date of a late reprint is given for book that reached its final form much earlier. Two books by Stopford Brooke (d. 1916) are dated 1932 and 1948; Craig's Oxford edition (1892), 1904; Onions's *Glossary*, second edition (1919), 1929; Hardin Craig's *Enchanted Glass* (1936), 1950; Nichol Smith's World's Classics *Shakespeare Criticism* (1916), 1946. Sheer misprints are Flatter, *Hamlet's Father*, 1940 (for 1949), Yoder, *Animal Analogy*, 1941 (for 1947).

Other errors are more venial. Prices are a problem in these inflationary days. But

the current prices of the new Arden texts ought to have been got right (12s. 6d., 15s., and 18s.), and the new price of Spurgeon's *Shakespeare's Imagery* (45s.). The price of the Warwick edition is quaintly misprinted 3s. 5d. Some works now out of print are given with prices, e.g. the two by Roy Walker, Noble's *Shakespeare's Biblical Knowledge* and Pollard's *Shakespeare's Folios and Quartos*. Minor errors: p. 4, Wright, G. (read W.) Aldis; pp. 7 and 8, *Shakespeare Association Bulletin* is now *Shakespeare Quarterly*; p. 17, Bradley's *A Miscellany* was published by Macmillan; p. 25, s.v. Reynolds, *Taurus* (read *Tarras*); p. 30, Le Franc (read Lefranc). The description of Craig's normally eclectic text as 'substantially that of the First Folio, in modern spelling' is misleading; and the reference (p. 5) to 'imperfect first quartos' might lead the beginner to think of a physical imperfection in the books. One desideratum: to the very short list of critical studies up to 1900 should be added Moulton's *Shakespeare as a Dramatic Artist*.

J. C. MAXWELL.

**The Celestial Cycle. The Theme of *Paradise Lost* in World Literature with Translations of the Major Analogues.** By WATSON KIRKCONNELL. Pp. xvii + 701. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1952; London: Geoffrey Cumberlege, 1953. \$8.50; 60s. net.

Although this book has *Paradise Lost* as its starting-point, it is also a study in comparative literature. After briefly sketching the history of Milton's theme through the ages, President Kirkconnell prints texts, some in the original and some in translation, of the main works of literature that are behind Milton, and ends with a descriptive catalogue of 329 analogous works or parts of works, ranging in time from the Sumerian tablet excavated at Nippur to Paul Valéry's *Lust, la demoiselle de Cristal*, published in 1946.

A very large amount of labour has gone to this book. Finding Barham's translation of Grotius's *Adamus Exul* and the Hayley-Cowper translation of Andreini's *L'Adamo* in their different ways unsatisfactory, the compiler has made his own, more faithful, translations. Indeed the bulk of the translations (and these form the bulk of the total texts) are the compiler's. Students of Milton have now got in accessible form the main texts to which he was or may have been indebted in the creation of *Paradise Lost* and they should feel suitably grateful to the severe labour that has gone to giving them this facility. Avitus, Grotius, Vondel, and others are now side by side in one volume. And though the translations are not of literary importance (that of 'Caedmonian' *Paradise Lost* strikes me as the most felicitous) they testify to the wide linguistic range and the industry of the translator. There was good reason to include the little accessible foreign works: but things so accessible as Spenser's *Hymns* and Cowley's *Davideis* could have been confined with advantage to the descriptive catalogue; to the welcome shortening of an uncomfortably long and heavy volume.

The descriptive catalogue is excellent. It does not claim to be exhaustive; but it is wonderfully full and gives just the amount of information an inquisitive reader would naturally require. One of the most interesting entries concerns Salandra's Morality Play, *Adamo Caduto*, known to many English readers as the supposed original of *Paradise Lost* through Norman Douglas's *Old Calabria*. Douglas is said to have borne the world a grudge for taking little notice of his so-called discovery. How ungrounded that grudge was Kirkconnell's note shows. The catalogue is in itself a work of massive scholarship.

E. M. W. TILLYARD

**Jane Austen's Letters to her sister Cassandra and others.** Collected and edited by R. W. CHAPMAN. Second Edition. Pp. xlvi + 519 + [63]. London, New York, Toronto: Cumberlege, Oxford University Press, 1952. 42s. net.

Happy the editor who can claim that no considerable hoard of his subject's letters is likely to come to light hereafter. Twenty years have passed since Dr. Chapman made this

claim, and since then he has been able to discover no more than four letters from Jane Austen hitherto unpublished. The text of the Letters remains substantially the same as in 1932: even though nineteen of the thirty manuscripts which had previously escaped detection have now been traced, only two of them were found to contain passages excised before publication, and one of these arrived in time for the excisions to be printed in the notes to the first edition (where they still remain).

Happy, too, the editor who after twenty years need alter so little in his editorial apparatus. Change in ownership of manuscripts is indicated; a page of small corrections and additions is made to the notes; a contemporary drawing of Steventon Rectory replaces the sketch which Anna Lefroy drew from memory; and the suggestion that for Jane Austen a 'handkerchief' is ('never a pocket h. ?') is removed from the generous Index, which has received numerous other adjustments.

J. B.

**The Victorian Temper.** By JEROME HAMILTON BUCKLEY. Pp. xiv+282. London: Allen & Unwin, Ltd., 1952. 30s. net.

The aim of this book is explained in the preface—explained clearly where negative:

The chapters that follow constitute neither an intellectual history of Victorian England nor an ordered survey of Victorian letters. They strive neither to trace in detail the growth, for example, of scientific or religious thought nor to examine the specific development of dominant literary genres like the novel or the personal lyric. . . . In so far as I have sought an interpretation of what might be called the Victorian temper rather than a reappraisal of Victorian talents, I have attempted no detailed analysis of the major artists as such, no close criticism of such doughty figures as Arnold or George Eliot, Meredith or Hardy;

but not so clearly where positive:

[The chapters] are devoted rather to a charting of the impulses that prompted and the forces that shaped a manifold creative expression, to a study in particular of the 'moral aesthetic', its rise and decline, and its relation always to a variable climate of opinion and emotion. Though I have tried to indicate, where possible, parallel motifs in Victorian painting and in the plastic arts, I have drawn most freely upon literary sources, including a good many minor writers whose work, whatever its subsequent fate, was in its day broadly representative. . . . I have chosen a relatively few centers of literary influence—Carlyle, for instance, Tennyson, Kingsley, Ruskin, Oscar Wilde—and from these I have repeatedly widened the focus of discussion to embrace a number of the 'schools' and the movements, the leagues and the coteries, that lent a tension and a vitality to the whole Victorian background.

That, I think, along with the too-simple title of the book, is a poor preparation for the body of the book itself which, though it is mainly concerned with ideas, often uses language with some precision, and not infrequently with weight. There are many remarks, of course, that one could take up and reject, but few that are not interesting. Mr. Buckley has a good mind and is dealing with matter he has explored, and sometimes discovered, for himself. His powers are wide enough to enable him to write equally well on Tennyson and J. S. Mill, to be equally interesting on T. H. Green and on the way poets and novelists of the time use water-symbols to represent spiritual regeneration. The obvious danger of a book which, in relation to its range of seventy crowded years, is brief, is the danger of 'bitterness', but Mr. Buckley escapes it, mainly by seeing the bits at close quarters. A weakness occasionally apparent is that some things are seen as new which in fact survive from, or have their source in, an earlier century.

GEOFFREY TILLOTSON

SU

BULLE

LIBRA

Vol. x

Bro

mat

349-

Rob

coln

482-

DURHA

Vol. xi

The

draft

(J. T

ELIH

Vol. x

The

(Ben

A we

Finn

[M

Mar

mers

Wor

tium

ENGLIS

Vol. xx

The

the

Wilki

M.

(Wal

The

poet

113-

Ano

Sir T

pp. 1

The

Wil

## SUMMARY OF PERIODICAL LITERATURE

By A. MACDONALD

### BULLETIN OF THE JOHN RYLANDS LIBRARY

Vol. xxxv, No. 2, March 1953

Browning: the making of the dramatic lyric (H. B. Charlton), pp. 349-84.  
Robert Grosseteste, Bishop of Lincoln (Sir Maurice Powicke), pp. 482-507.

### DURHAM UNIVERSITY JOURNAL

Vol. xiv, No. 3, June 1953

The *Reflections*: Burke's preliminary draft and methods of composition (J. T. Boulton), pp. 114-19.

### ELH

Vol. xx, No. 2, June 1953

The narrator of the *Canterbury Tales* (Ben Kimpel), pp. 77-86.  
A world of instruments (Gretchen L. Finney), pp. 87-120.  
[Musical symbolism in the 16th and 17th centuries]

Marvell's 'Nature' (Joseph H. Summers), pp. 121-35.  
Word and sound in Yeats's 'Byzantium' (David I. Masson), pp. 136-60.

### ENGLISH STUDIES

Vol. xxxiv, No. 3, June 1953

The rise of English verse satire in the eighteenth century (Andrew M. Wilkinson), pp. 97-108.  
M. G. Lewis and Mme de Staél (Walter Moss), pp. 109-12.

The earliest printing of Old English poetry (Henry Bosley Woolf), pp. 113-15.

Another Renaissance biography of Sir Thomas More (R. J. Schoeck), pp. 115-17.

The text of *The Castle of Indolence* (William B. Todd), pp. 117-21.

### ESSAYS IN CRITICISM

Vol. iii, No. 3, July 1953

The idea of Culture (Raymond Williams), pp. 239-66.

Metaphor and symbol in the sixteenth century (Maurice Evans), pp. 267-84.

Enter the Shakespearean tragic hero (Huntington Brown), pp. 285-302.

*Moll Flanders* and *Manon Lescaut* (A. E. Rodway), pp. 303-20.

Symbol and image in the later work of Henry James (Miriam Allott), pp. 321-36.

Synge's *Playboy*: morality and the hero (Norman Podhoretz), pp. 337-44.

### ETUDES ANGLAISES

VI<sup>e</sup> Année, No. 2, Mai 1953

Dialogue in novels and plays (Charles Morgan), pp. 97-108.

Dans l'ombre de la guerre (L. Cazamian), pp. 109-16.

John Keats. Extraits d'un cours inédit (Charles Du Bos), pp. 117-21.

### HUNTINGTON LIBRARY QUARTERLY

Vol. xvi, No. 3, May 1953

Fulke Greville: kingship and sovereignty (Hugh N. Maclean), pp. 237-71.

James VI in the *Shephearde Calender* (Paul E. McLane), pp. 273-85.

More Drummond borrowings (Robert Ellrodt), pp. 305-10.

### MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

Vol. lxviii, No. 4, April 1953

Keats's wailful choir of small gnats (Bertram L. Woodruff), pp. 217-20.

Yeats's 'The Cat and the Moon' (Carl Benson), pp. 220-3.

'The insolent rudeness of Dr. Swift' (Louis A. Landa), pp. 223-6.  
 A source for Spenser's Malbecco (William Nelson), pp. 226-9.  
 Milton's two-handed engine (J. Milton French), pp. 229-31.  
 Chaucer's comic valentine (Haldeen Braddy), pp. 232-4.  
 Scribal errors in Manly and Rickert's *Text* (Theodore A. Stroud), pp. 234-7.  
 An eighteenth-century theft of Chaucer's *Purse* (Edmund P. Dandridge, Jr.), pp. 237-8.  
 A note on Donne's 'Elegy VIII' (D. C. Allen), pp. 238-9.  
 'Blind mouths' in *Lycidas* (Robert J. Kane), pp. 239-40.

*Vol. lxviii, No. 5, May 1953*

A note on *Beowulf* 377 ff. (Kemp Malone), pp. 354-6.  
 Two notes on *Paradise Lost* (D. C. Allen), pp. 360-1.  
 Keats and Benjamin Bailey on the imagination (Earl R. Wasserman), pp. 361-5.

*Vol. lxviii, No. 6, June 1953*

Samuel Johnson in Brunswick (Robert F. Metzdorf), pp. 397-400.  
 The rosemary theme in *Romeo and Juliet* (Philip Williams), pp. 400-3.  
 Wordsworth's annotations in Daniel's *Poetical Works* (Cecil C. Seronsy), pp. 403-6.  
*The Monk* and *Le diable amoureux* (Louis F. Peck), pp. 406-8.  
 Smollett's 'Gothic': an illustration (Catherine L. Almirall), pp. 408-10.

## MODERN LANGUAGE REVIEW

*Vol. xlvi, No. 3, July 1953*

Chapman's 'Tragedy of Bussy d'Ambois': problems of the revised quarto (Peter Ure), pp. 257-69.  
 Charles Dickens and the Department of Practical Art (K. J. Fielding), pp. 270-7.

Marlowe's 'river Araris' (J. Oliver Thomson), pp. 323-4.

A note on the imagery of Donne's 'Loves Growth' (Nancy P. Brown), pp. 324-7.

## MODERN PHILOLOGY

*Vol. I, No. 4, May 1953*

Milton's critical use of historical sources: an illustration (Ernest Sirluck), pp. 226-31.  
 The meanings of 'myth' in modern criticism (Wallace W. Douglas), pp. 232-42.

## NEOPHILOLOGUS

*37ste Jaarg., Afl. 3, 1 Juli 1953*

Joseph Conrad's western eye (I) (A. G. H. Bachrach), pp. 157-66.

## NINETEENTH-CENTURY FICTION

*Vol. viii, No. 1, June 1953*

Jane Austen in France (Noel J. King), pp. 1-26.  
*'Orley Farm'* and real fiction (Robert Martin Adams), pp. 27-41.  
 Gissing's revision of 'The Unclassed' (Joseph J. Wolff), pp. 42-52.

## NOTES AND QUERIES

*Vol. cxviii, No. 5, May 1953*

Playwrights and pike-trailers in the Low Countries (Abraham B. Feldman), pp. 184-7.  
 The sources of Robert Greene's 'A Quip for an upstart Courtier' (Edwin H. Miller), pp. 187-90.  
 [See *N. & Q.* cxviii. 148-52]

More allusions to Shakespeare in Beaumont and Fletcher (Murray Abend), pp. 191-2.

Some further Pope-Dryden indebtedness? (H. W. Jones), pp. 199-200.

Dr. Johnson's English prose reading (A. D. Atkinson), pp. 206-10.  
 [Continued *ibid.* 288-93]

*Vol. cxviii*  
 Notes  
 of S  
 (Rich  
 Muir  
 The  
 tion  
 pp. 2  
 Men  
 pp. 2  
 'No  
 tribu  
 pp. 2  
 Wor  
 (H.  
 Mar  
 tor'  
 Clou  
 (Han  
 Gam  
 (J. C

*Vol. cxviii*  
 The  
 jectu  
 Hor  
 (No  
 Bibl  
 173  
 Joh  
 Sch  
 'Na  
 cent  
 pp.  
 A  
 (Do

*PHILO*  
*Vol. x*  
 Year  
 She  
 Year  
 (Fr  
 Joh  
 poe  
 Th  
 (Ec

## SUMMARY OF PERIODICAL LITERATURE 409

### *Vol. cxviii, No. 6, June 1953*

Notes on the text and interpretation of Sir Thomas Wyatt's poetry (Richard C. Harrier and Kenneth Muir), pp. 234-6.

The source of Falstaff's contamination of the army (C. A. Greer), pp. 236-7.

Menenius's fable (Kenneth Muir), pp. 240-2.

'No warbler he'—a contemporary tribute to Johnson (D. J. Greene), pp. 243-4.

Wordsworth and his Italian studies (H. Rossiter Smith), pp. 248-50.

*Martin Chuzzlewit* and 'The Liberator' (K. J. Fielding), pp. 254-6.

Clough: 'Say not the Struggle' (Harry W. Rudman), pp. 261-3.

Gammer Gurton's Needle, i. i. 39-40 (J. C. Maxwell), p. 266.

### *Vol. cxviii, No. 7, July 1953*

The text of 'Respublica': a conjecture (T. W. Craik), p. 279.

Horatio's 'you might have rhymed' (Norman Nathan), pp. 282-3.

Bibliography of Ned Ward (1667-1731) (W. J. Cameron), pp. 284-6.

Johnson on Juvenal (Francis G. Schoff), pp. 293-6.

'Natural Philosophy' and eighteenth century satire (Margaret Turner), pp. 296-9.

A note on Jane Austen's method (Donald L. Fryxell), pp. 299-300.

### PHILOLOGICAL QUARTERLY

#### *Vol. xxxii, No. 1, January 1953*

Yeats's 'The Song of the Happy Shepherd' (Marion Witt), pp. 1-8.

Yeats's Byzantium and its sources (Frederick L. Gwynn), pp. 9-21.

John Skelton: the structure of the poem (Alan Swallow), pp. 29-42.

Thomas More and the great books (Edward L. Surtz), pp. 43-57.

Eliot's *Cocktail Party* and the new humanism (Edward Schwartz), pp. 58-68.

John Oldham, the Wits, and *A Satyr against Vertue* (David M. Vieth), pp. 90-93.

Johnson and Chesterfield once more (Benjamin Boyce), pp. 93-96.

### PUBLICATIONS OF THE MODERN LANGUAGE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA

#### *Vol. lxviii, No. 3, June 1953*

Technique, symbol, and theme in *Heartbreak House* (Frederick P. W. McDowell), pp. 345-56.

Rima's mother (Hoxie N. Fairchild), pp. 357-70.

Henry James's *What Maisie Knew*: a comparison with the plans in *The Notebooks* (Ward S. Worden), pp. 371-83.

Matthew Arnold and the *Academy*: a note on English criticism in the eighteen-seventies (Diderik Roll-Hansen), pp. 384-96.

The critical reception of Tennyson's 'Maud' (Edgar F. Shannon, Jr.), pp. 397-417.

Tennyson's 'Allegory in the Distance' (S. C. Burchell), pp. 418-24.

Lord Eldon's censorship (Paul M. Zall), pp. 436-43.

Wordsworth's 'inscrutable workmanship' and the emblems of reality (James R. Baird), pp. 444-57.

Edmund Burke and the two *Annual Registers* (Bertram D. Sarason), pp. 496-508.

The economics of Iago and others (Robert B. Heilman), pp. 555-71.

Originality, controlling purpose, and craftsmanship in Chaucer's *Man of Law's Tale* (Edward A. Block), pp. 572-616.

The holograph of Milton's letter to Holstenius (Joseph McG. Bottkol), pp. 617-27.

## 410 SUMMARY OF PERIODICAL LITERATURE

RIVISTA DI LETTERATURA MODERNE  
*Anno iv, No. 1, Gennaio-Marzo 1953*  
 Shakespeare and the Lombard cities  
 (John Draper), pp. 54-58.

### STUDIES IN PHILOLOGY

*Vol. I, No. 2, April 1953*

Skelton's 'Upon a Deedmans Hed': new light on the origin of the Skeltonic (Robert S. Kinsman), pp. 101-9.

Rhetoric and law in sixteenth-century England (R. J. Schoeck), pp. 110-27.

A function of myth in Marlowe's 'Hero and Leander' (Paul W. Miller), pp. 158-67.

Links between Shakespeare's history plays (Robert Adger Law), pp. 168-87.

The 'devil's crest' in *Measure for Measure* (Alwin Thaler), pp. 188-94. *The Case is Altered*: initial comedy of humours (John Jacob Enck), pp. 195-214.

Pareus, the Stuarts, Laud, and Milton (George W. Whiting), pp. 215-29.

## LIST OF PUBLICATIONS RECEIVED

January-June 1953

[Unless otherwise stated, London is the place and 1953 the date of each publication.]

ACKERMAN, R. W. An Index of the Arthurian Names in Middle English. Stanford, Calif., 1952. pp. xxvi+250. 28s.

ARDERN, P. S. (ed.). First Readings in Old English. [2nd edn.] Wellington, N.Z., 1951. pp. 1+270. 27s. 6d.

ARDERNE, J. Directions Concerning the Matter and Style of Sermons, ed. J. Mackay. Oxford, 1952. pp. xiv+30.

ATWOOD, E. B. A Survey of Verb Forms in the Eastern United States. Ann Arbor. pp. viii+53. \$2.50.

BALDI, S. La Poesia di Sir Thomas Wyatt. Firenze, pp. xii+254. L. 950.

BAXTER, J. W. William Dunbar. Edinburgh, 1952. pp. viii+254. 21s.

DE BEER, G. R., G. A. BONNARD, and L. JUNOD (eds.). Miscellanies Gibboniana. Lausanne, 1952. pp. 149. No price given.

BOAS, F. S. An Introduction to Eighteenth-Century Drama, 1700-1780. Oxford. pp. x+365. 25s.

BOWERS, F. (ed.). Studies in Bibliography: Vol. v, 1952-1953. Charlottesville, 1952. pp. iv+230. \$6.00.

BRADNER, L., and C. A. LYNCH (eds.). The Latin Epigrams of Thomas More. Chicago, pp. xliv+255. \$7.50.

BRIDGES, R. Poetical Works. [2nd edn.] pp. viii+713. 12s. 6d.

BRINK, C. O. Imagination and Imitation. Liverpool, pp. ii+22. 2s.

BRITISH ACADEMY. Proceedings, vol. xxxvi, 1950. pp. xii+297. 42s.

BUXTON, J. (ed.). Poems of Michael Drayton. 2 vols. pp. xliv+306; vi+307-724. 30s.

BYRNE, M. ST. CLARE (ed.). The French Littleton by Claudius Holbony. Cambridge. pp. xxxii+220. 18s.

CAZAMIAN, L. The Development of English Humor. Parts I and II. Durham, N.C., 1952. pp. x+421. 45s.

CHAPMAN, R. W. Johnsonian and Other Essays and Reviews. Oxford. pp. viii+243. 12s. 6d.

CHAUCER, G. The Prologue to the Canterbury Tales, ed. R. T. Davies. pp. 160. 6s. 6d.

CLEMEN, W. Wandlung des Botenberichts bei Shakespeare. Sitzungsberichte der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Jahrgang 1952, Heft 4. pp. 1-46.

COHEN, A. The Phonemes of English. The Hague, 1952. pp. viii+127. 6 guilders.

COLERIDGE, S. T. Christabel. Parts III and IV, mainly by D. B. Lyman, Jr. Supplement to The CEA Critic, vol. xv, No. 3, March 1953. pp. 40.

CRANE, R. S., and others. English Literature 1660-1800. A Bibliography. Vol. ii:

1939-1  
579-12

DAHL, F.  
rantos  
1642.

FUJIMUR  
of Wi  
232. 2

GEROULI  
Prince  
125. 6c

GORDON  
lx+16

GREG, W.  
O.S. N

HAGSTRU  
Litera  
pp. xi

HALL, J.  
(1649  
pp. x

HAMMER  
Legen  
Roug

HOHOLF  
1901-  
400.

HOLLOW  
viii+1

HOPKIN  
Reev  
HORNE,  
of G  
pp. x

JASSEN,  
Engli  
Wroc

— Stre  
pp. 2

JOHNSO  
Victo  
pp. 1

JONES,  
Lang

KIRKCO  
Tore

KNIGH  
pest

Piers  
of th

LAMM  
Ellie

LOUG  
1675

40s.

1939-1950. Princeton, 1952. pp. vi+579-1292. 48s.

DAHL, F. A Bibliography of English Co-  
rantos and Periodical Newsbooks 1620-  
1642. 1952. pp. 283.

FUJIMURA, T. H. The Restoration Comedy  
of Wit. Princeton, N.J., 1952. pp. x+  
232. 25s.

GEROULD, G. H. Chaucerian Essays.  
Princeton, N.J., 1952. pp. viii+103.  
12s. 6d.

GORDON, E. V. (ed.). Pearl. Oxford. pp.  
lx+167. 12s. 6d.

GREG, W. W. (ed.). *Respubblica*. (E.E.T.S.,  
o.s. No. 226.) pp. xxii+83. 18s. 6d.

HAGSTRUM, JEAN H. Samuel Johnson's  
Literary Criticism. Minneapolis, 1952.  
pp. xii+212. 28s.

HALL, J. The Advancement of Learning  
(1649), ed. A. K. Croston. Liverpool.  
pp. xv+54. 5s.

HAMMER, C., Jr. Longfellow's 'Golden  
Legend' and Goethe's 'Faust'. Baton  
Rouge, 1952. pp. 36. 50s.

HOHLFELD, A. R. Fifty Years with Goethe  
1901-1951. Madison, Wis. pp. xiv+  
400. \$5.00.

HOLLOWAY, J. The Victorian Sage. pp.  
viii+301. 18s.

HOPKINS, G. M. Selected Poems, ed. J.  
Reeves. pp. xxviii+103. 6s.

HORNE, D. H. The Life and Minor Works  
of George Peele. New Haven, 1952.  
pp. xviii+305. 32s. 6d.

JASSEM, W. Intonation of Conversational  
English (Educated Southern British).  
Wrocław, 1952. pp. 122. Zl. 24.  
— Stress in Modern English. Kraków, 1952.  
pp. 21-49.

JOHNSON, E. D. H. The Alien Vision of  
Victorian Poetry. Princeton, N.J., 1952.  
pp. xvi+224. 25s.

JONES, R. F. The Triumph of the English  
Language. pp. xiv+340. 30s.

KIRKCONNELL, W. The Celestial Cycle.  
Toronto, 1952. pp. xxviii+701. 60s.

KNIGHT, G. W. The Shakespearian Tem-  
pest. [3rd edn.] pp. xxvi+332. 21s.

KNOTT, T. A., and D. C. FOWLER (eds.).  
Piers the Plowman. A Critical Edition  
of the A-Version. Baltimore, 1952. pp.  
xiv+302. 36s.

LAMM, M. Modern Drama, trans. K.  
Elliott. Oxford, 1952. pp. xx+359. 25s.

LOUGH, J. (ed.). Locke's Travels in France  
1675-1678. Cambridge. pp. lxvi+309.  
40s.

MACDONALD, H., and M. HARGREAVES.  
Thomas Hobbes. A Bibliography. 1952.  
pp. xviii+84.

MCILWRAITH, A. K. (ed.). Five Stuart  
Tragedies. pp. xxii+497. 7s. 6d.

MCINTOSH, A. An Introduction to a Survey  
of Scottish Dialects. pp. xii+122.  
7s. 6d.

MACK, E. C., and W. H. G. ARMYTAGE.  
Thomas Hughes. 1952. pp. 302. 30s.

Malone Society. When you See me you  
Know me. By Samuel Rowley, 1605.  
Eds. F. P. Wilson and J. Crow. Oxford,  
1952. pp. xx+(unnumbered). No price  
given.

— The Conflict of Conscience by Nathaniel  
Woodes 1581. Eds. H. Davis and F. P.  
Wilson. Oxford, 1952. pp. xii+(un-  
numbered). No price given.

MARCKWARDT, A. H. (ed.). Laurence  
Nowell's *Vocabularium Saxonum*. Ann  
Arbor, 1952. pp. x+198. 40s.

MARGOLIOUTH, H. M. Wordsworth and  
Coleridge 1795-1834. pp. viii+206. 6s.

MARSH, F. Wordsworth's Imagery. New  
Haven, 1952. pp. xii+146. 24s.

MARVELL, A. The Poems and Letters, ed.  
H. M. Margoliouth. 2 vols. [and edn.]  
Oxford, 1952. pp. xvi+347; viii+373.  
45s.

MOSSE, F. A Handbook of Middle English,  
trans. J. A. Walker. Baltimore, 1952.  
pp. xxvi+495. 45s.

NISBET, A. Dickens & Ellen Ternan.  
Berkeley, Calif., 1952. pp. xviii+89.  
21s.

NITCHIE, E. Mary Shelley Author of  
'Frankenstein'. New Brunswick, N.J.  
pp. xiv+255. No price given.

NORTHAM, J. Ibsen's Dramatic Method.  
pp. 232. 21s.

NOYES, R. G. The Thespian Mirror. Provi-  
dence, R.I. pp. 200. \$5.50.

QUINLAN, M. J. William Cowper. Minne-  
apolis. pp. xiv+251. 36s.

QUITAMA, R. The Mind and Art of  
Jonathan Swift. [2nd edn.] pp. xvi+  
400. 21s.

RANTAVAARA, I. Virginia Woolf and  
Bloomsbury. Helsinki. pp. 171. 500 mk.

READ, H. The True Voice of Feeling.  
pp. 382. 25s.

RILKE, R. M. The Life of Mary, trans.  
N. K. Cruickshank. Edinburgh, n.d.  
pp. viii+45. 6s.

ROE, I. Shelley. The Last Phase. pp. 256.  
18s.

SCHOLES, P. A. The Life and Activities of  
Sir John Hawkins. pp. xiv+287. 35s.

SCHUBEL, F. Die 'Fashionable Novels'. Uppsala, 1952. pp. 327. 16s.

SENSABAUGH, G. F. That Grand Whig Milton. Stanford, Calif., 1952. pp. x+213. 32s.

SHAKESPEARE, W. Neu übersetzt von R. Flatter. 1 Bd. Wien, 1952. pp. 572.

— Troilus and Cressida, eds. H. N. Hillebrand and T. W. Baldwin. Philadelphia. pp. xx+613. \$17.50.

SHANNON, E. F., Jr. Tennyson and the Reviewers. Cambridge, Mass., 1952. pp. xiv+232. 25s.

SIEAM, K. Studies in the History of Old English Literature. Oxford. pp. viii+314. 30s.

SMITH, H. Elizabethan Poetry. Cambridge, Mass., 1952. pp. xii+355. 32s. 6d.

SMITHERS, G. V. (ed.). Kyng Alisaunder. Vol. i. Text. (E.E.T.S., o.s. No. 227.) pp. xx+445. 35s.

SPROTT, S. E. Milton's Art of Prosody. Oxford. pp. xii+147. 15s.

Studier i modern Språkvetenskap. Vol. xviii. Uppsala. pp. 171. Sw. Kr. 11.00.

SWEET, H. Anglo-Saxon Primer, revised N. Davis. [6th edn.] Oxford. pp. viii+129. 7s. 6d.

SWIFT, J. Political Tracts 1713-1719, ed. H. Davis and I. Ehrenpreis. Oxford. pp. xi+243. 21s.

TAKAHASHI, G. A Study of *Everyman*. Tokio, n.d. pp. 80+22. No price given.

TEMPLE, R. Z. The Critic's Alchemy. New York. pp. 345. \$4.00.

VINCENT, E. R. Ugo Foscolo. Cambridge. pp. viii+255. 25s.

VISSEUR, F. Th. A Syntax of the English Language of St. Thomas More. II. Louvain, 1952. pp. xx+449-752.

WAITH, E. M. The Pattern of Tragedy in Beaumont and Fletcher. New Haven, 1952. pp. xiv+212. 25s.

WALKER, A. Textual Problems of the First Folio. Cambridge. pp. viii+170. 18s.

WHITAKER, V. K. Shakespeare's Learning. San Marino, Calif. pp. x+366. \$6.50.

WHITE, N. J., F. L. JONES, and K. N. CAMERON. An Examination of the Shelley Legend. Philadelphia, 1951. pp. xii+114. \$2.50.

WHITE, R. J. (ed.). Political Tracts of Wordsworth, Coleridge and Shelley. Cambridge. pp. xiv+303. 30s.

WILKINSON, C. S. The Wake of The Bounty. pp. xiv+200. 18s.

WILSON, F. P. Marlowe and the Early Shakespeare. Oxford. pp. viii+144. 12s. 6d.

WÖLCKEN, F. Der literarische Mord. Nürnberg. pp. 348. DM. 12.80.

WRENN, C. L. (ed.). Beowulf. pp. 318. 21s.

WRIGHT, H. G. The First English Translation of the 'Decameron' (1620). Uppsala. pp. 279. 16s.

## INDEX

Abercrombie, L., *The Art of Wordsworth*, revd., 293.

Aldridge, A. O., *Shaftesbury and the Deist Manifesto*, revd., 78.

*Ancrene Rite: The English Text of the A.R.*, ed. Mabel Day, revd., 278.

Anderson, G. K., *The Literature of the Anglo-Saxons*, revd., 149. See also Craig, H.

*Annual Bibliography of English Language and Literature*, Vol. XXII, 1941, ed. A. Macdonald and L. N. Broughton, and Vol. XXIII, 1942, ed. A. Macdonald and H. J. Pettit, revd., 399.

Appleton, W. A., *A Cycle of Cathay: the Chinese Vogue in England during the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries*, noticed, 92.

Arbuthnot, John. See Scriblerus Club.

Armytage, W. H. G., art. by, Matthew Arnold and T. H. Huxley: Some New Letters 1870-80, 346.

Arnold, Matthew. See Armytage, W. H. G., Tillotson, Kathleen (arts.); Faverty, F. E. (revd.).

Athelstan: *A Middle English Romance*, ed. A. McL. Trounce, revd., 276.

Atkins, J. W. H., *English Literary Criticism: 17th and 18th Centuries*, revd., 184.

Austen, Jane: *J. A.'s Letters to her sister Cassandra and others*, ed. R. W. Chapman, noticed, 405.

Bacon, Francis. See James, D. G.

Beach, J. W. See Craig, H.

Beaumont, Francis. See Danby, J. F.

*Benedictine Office, The*. See Ure, J. M.

Benlowes, Edward. See Jenkins, H.

*Beowulf: The Thorkelin Transcripts of B. in Facsimile*, ed. K. Malone (Early English Manuscripts in Facsimile, Vol. I), revd., 274.

Bethell, S. L., *The Cultural Revolution of the Seventeenth Century*, revd., 76.

Beverley, Peter. See Prouty, C. T.

Bjersby,  
*Cuchulain  
Yeats*,  
Blake, W.  
Blanchard,  
Bland, D.  
*The Ca  
Blennier  
Place-  
276.*  
Bose, A.  
'Annu  
Boweswell,  
G. B.  
L. F.  
*Hebr  
Wales  
mous  
390.*  
Bowers,  
Bredvol  
Breton,  
*hither  
canou  
revd.*  
Brough,  
Brough  
*of E*  
Brown,  
Brown  
Brunne  
*gesch  
194.*  
Buckie  
*noti*  
Burns,  
Burton  
Byrne  
*The*  
Byron  
Callanan  
*Doo*  
Cawle  
*Ty*  
Chapp  
*Per*  
*rev*  
Chap  
*Jac*  
Chap  
*Chau*  
Chet  
*ed*  
Clar  
*G*  
Cloud  
*A*  
*N*  
*8*  
*A*  
*T*  
Col

Bjersby, Birgit. *The Interpretation of the Cuchulain Legend in the Works of W. B. Yeats*, revd., 86.

Blake, William. See Margoliouth, H. M.

Blanchard, R. See Steele, Richard.

Bland, D. S., note by, A Word in Shirley's *The Cardinal*, 358.

Blenner-Hassett, R., *A Study of the Place-Names in Lawman's Brut*, revd., 276.

Bose, A., art. by, The Verse of the English 'Annals', 38.

Boswell, James: *B.'s Life of Johnson . . .*, ed. G. B. Hill. Revised and enlarged edn. by L. F. Powell. Vol. V. *The Tour to the Hebrides and The Journey into North Wales*. Vol. VI. *Index, Table of Anonymous Persons, Bibliography, Errata*, revd., 390.

Bowers, F. See *Studies in Bibliography*.

Bredvold, L. I. See Craig, H.

Bretton, Nicholas: *Poems by N. B. (not hitherto reprinted)*, ed. with biography, canon, and notes, by Jean Robertson, revd., 381.

Broughton, Dorothy. See Diaper, William.

Broughton, L. N. See *Annual Bibliography of English Language and Literature*.

Browne, William. See Grundy, Joan.

Browning, Robert. See Stone, W. H.

Brunner, K., *Die englische Sprache: ihre geschichtliche Entwicklung*, 2. Bd., revd., 194.

Buckley, J. H., *The Victorian Temper*, noticed, 406.

Burns, Robert. See Daiches, D.

Burton, Robert. See Mueller, W. R.

Byrne, M. St. Clare, ed., *Studies in English Theatre History*, noticed, 94.

Byron, Lord. See Sarmiento, E.

Callan, N., art. by, Pope's *Iliad*: A New Document, 109.

Cawley, R. R., *Milton and the Literature of Travel*, revd., 288.

Chapman, C. O., *An Index of Names in Pearl, Purity, Patience, and Gawain*, revd., 276.

Chapman, George. See Fay, H. C. (art.); Jacquot, J. (revd.).

Chapman, R. W. See Austen, Jane.

Chaucer, Geoffrey. See Thomas, Mary E.

Chettle, Henry, *The Tragedy of Hoffman*, ed. H. Jenkins, revd., 168.

Clare, John: *Selected Poems of J. C.*, ed. G. Grigson, noticed, 93.

Clough, Arthur Hugh: *The Poems of A. H. C.*, ed. H. F. Lowry, A. L. P. Norrington, and F. L. Mulhause, revd., 81; Clough and *In Memoriam*, note by A. L. P. Norrington, 364. See also Tillotson, Kathleen (art.).

Coleridge, Samuel Taylor. See Johnson, S. F.

Common Sense. See Jones, G. H.

Congreve, William. See Lynch, Kathleen M.

Conrad, Joseph. See Hewitt, D.

Cook, M. McL. See Fletcher, John.

Craig, H. (general editor), *A History of English Literature* (by G. K. Anderson, H. Craig, L. I. Bredvold, and J. W. Beach), revd., 401.

Craik, T. W., art. by, The Political Interpretation of Two Tudor Interludes: *Temperance and Humility* and *Wealth and Health*, 98.

Dahl, Torsten, *Linguistic Studies in some Elizabethan Writings. I. An Inquiry into Aspects of the Language of Thomas Deloney*, revd., 280.

Daiches, D., *Robert Burns*, revd., 392.

Danby, J. F., *Poets on Fortune's Hill: Studies in Sidney, Shakespeare, Beaumont and Fletcher*, revd., 374.

Darbshire, Helen, *The Poet Wordsworth*, revd., 293; revised edn. of *The Poetical Works of William Wordsworth . . .*, ed. E. de Selincourt, revd., 393.

Davenport, A., ed. *The Whipper Pamphlets*, revd., 162.

Davies, Sir John. See Nosworthy, J. M.

Davis, H. See Swift, Jonathan.

Davis, N., note by, 'Hippopotamus' in Old English, 141.

Day, Mabel. See *Ancrene Riwle*.

Deloney, Thomas. See Dahl, Torsten.

De Selincourt, E. See Wordsworth, William.

Diaper, William: *The Complete Works of W. D.*, ed. Dorothy Broughton, revd., 186.

Dickins, B., and Wilson, R. M., edd., *Early Middle English Texts*, noticed, 404.

Donne, John: *The Prayers of J. D.*, sel. and ed. H. H. Umbach, revd., 167; *Essays in Divinity*, ed. Evelyn M. Simpson, revd., 287.

Drummond, William, *A Midnight's Trance*, ed. R. Ellrodt, revd., 164. See also Fogle, F. R.

Dryden, John. See Kinsley, J.

Eliot, George. See Hanson, L. and E.

Ellrodt, R. See Drummond, William. *English Miscellany*, ed. M. Praz. Vol. II, revd., 201.

*Essays and Studies*, 1951 (New Series, Vol. IV), coll. for the English Association by G. Tillotson, revd., 297.

Fawerty, F. E., *Matthew Arnold the Ethnologist*, revd., 191.

Fay, H. C., art. by, Poetry, Pedantry, and Life in Chapman's *Iliads*, 13.

Finch, Sir Henry. See Maas, P.

Fletcher, John, *Bondua (Malone Society Reprint)*, revd., 283; *Demetrius and Enanthe* by J. F., ed. M. McL. Cook and

F. P. Wilson, revd., 165. See also Danby, J. F.

Fogle, F. R., *A Critical Study of William Drummond of Hawthornden*, revd., 382.

Funke, O., *Englische Sprachkunde. Ein Überblick ab 1935*, revd., 88.

Gaskell, Elizabeth Cleghorn. See Hopkins, A. B.

Gawain. See Chapman, C. O.

Gay, John. See Scriblerus Club.

Gentleness and Nobility. See Wilson, F. P.

Gordon, I. A. See Shenstone, William.

Greg, W. W., *A Bibliography of the English Printed Drama to the Restoration*, Vol. II, revd., 180; Jonson's *Masque of Gipsies in the Burley, Belvoir, and Windsor Versions*, revd., 172.

Griggs, E. L., note by, on Wordsworth's *A Character*, 57.

Grigson, G. See Clare, John.

Grundy, Joan, art. by, William Browne and the Italian Pastoral, 305.

Gunn, A. M. F., *The Mirror of Love: A Re-interpretation of The Romance of the Rose*, noticed, 403.

Hall, John. See Turnbull, G. H.

Hall, Joseph: *The Life and Works of J. H.*, by T. F. Kinloch, revd., 178.

Hanson, L. and E., *Marian Evans and George Eliot: A Biography*, revd., 296.

Harley, Robert, earl of Oxford. See Scriblerus Club.

Harmer, F. E., *Anglo-Saxon Writs*, revd., 367.

Hartlib, Samuel. See Turnbull, G. H.

Havens, R. D., art. by, Assumed Personality, Insanity, and Poetry, 26.

Hawkins, Sir John. See Scholes, P. A.

Hay, D., *Polydore Vergil*, revd., 155.

Heist, W. W., note by, The Collars of Gurnth and Wamba [in *Ivanhoe*], 361.

Herford, C. H. See Jonson, Ben.

Herrick, M. T., *Comic Theory in the Sixteenth Century*, revd., 73.

Hewitt, D., *Conrad*, revd., 193.

Hexter, J. H., *More's Utopia. The Biography of an Idea*, revd., 372.

Hill, G. B. See Boswell, James.

*History of English Literature*, A. See Craig, H.

Hogan, C. B., *Shakespeare in the Theatre 1701-1800: A Record of Performances in London, 1701-1750*, revd., 379.

Hogarth, William: *H.'s Peregrination*, ed. C. Mitchell, revd., 292.

Hopkins, A. B., *Elizabeth Gaskell*, revd., 190.

Hotson, L., *Shakespeare's Motley*, revd., 378.

Huppé, B. F. See Robertson, D. W.

Huxley, Thomas Henry. See Armytage, W. H. G.

Jack, I., *Augustan Satire*, revd., 387.

Jacquot, J., *George Chapman*, revd., 169.

James, D. G., *The Dream of Learning: An Essay on The Advancement of Learning, Hamlet, and King Lear*, revd., 75.

Jenkins, H., *Edward Benlowes 1602-1676: Biography of a Minor Poet*, revd., 384; ed. *The Tragedy of Hoffman* by Henry Chettle, revd., 168.

Johansson, B., *Religion and Superstition in the Plays of Ben Jonson and Thomas Middleton*, revd., 171.

John Rylands Library: *Hand-list of Additions to the Collections of English Manuscripts in the J. R. L. 1937-1951*, by F. Taylor, noticed, 93.

Johnson, S. F., note by, Coleridge's *The Watchman: Decline and Fall*, 147.

Johnson, Samuel. See McAdam, E. L., Jr., and Monaghan, T. J. (arts.); Keast, W. R. (note); Boswell's *Life of J. & C.*, ed. G. B. Hill, revised by L. F. Powell, Vols. V and VI, revd., 390.

Jones, G. H., note by, The Jacobites, Charles Molloy, and *Common Sense*, 144.

Jones, R. F. and others, *The Seventeenth Century: Studies in the History of English Thought and Literature from Bacon to Pope*, revd., 182.

Jonson, Ben: B. J., ed. C. H. Herford, Percy and Evelyn Simpson. Vol. XI. *Commentary. Jonson's Literary Record. Supplementary Notes. Index*, revd., 285; J.'s *Masque of Gipsies in the Burley, Belvoir and Windsor Versions*, by W. W. Greg, revd., 172. See also Johansson, B.

Joseph, B. L., *Elizabethan Acting*, revd., 70.

Judith, ed. B. J. Timmer, revd., 365.

Kane, G., *Middle English Literature: A Critical Study of the Romances, the Religious Lyrics, Piers Plowman*, revd., 69.

Keast, W. R., note by, Some Emendations in Johnson's Preface to the *Dictionary*, 52.

Kerby-Miller, C. See Scriblerus Club.

Kermode, F., art. by, Milton's *Hero*, 317.

Kinloch, T. F., *The Life and Works of Joseph Hall*, revd., 178.

Kinsley, J., art. by, Dryden's *Bestiary*, 331; note by, Dryden and the *Encomium Musicae*, 263.

Kirkconnell, W., *The Celestial Cycle. The Theme of Paradise Lost in World Literature with Translations of the Major Analogues*, noticed, 405.

Knight, D., *Pope and the Heroic Tradition: A Critical Study of his Iliad*, revd., 291.

Langland, William. See Kane, G., Robertson, D. W.

Lawman. See Blenner-Hassett, R.

Lowry, H. F. See Clough, Arthur Hugh.

Luis de León, Fray. See Sarmiento, E.

Lydgate, John. See Schirmer, W. F.

Lynch, Kathleen M., *A Congreve Gallery*, revd., 385.

Maas, P., speare,  
McAdam,  
and Sau  
Macdonal  
and A  
Language  
McKillop  
Thomas  
MacLean  
for Wo  
Malone,  
Margoli  
92.  
Marlowe  
J. M.  
Marvell,  
Mathew  
America  
revd.,  
Maxwell  
Well  
of Ma  
Middleto  
Milton,  
Wright  
Kirke  
Mitchel  
Molloy,  
Monagh  
tion  
1773,  
Montag  
William  
Montag  
Elean  
More,  
Mueller  
Burke  
Muir,  
Mulhau  
Hugh  
Nicoll,  
161.  
Norris  
Hug  
Nowso  
of M  
grand  
Opie,  
of N  
Otway  
fish  
Oxford  
ed.  
Parne  
Patier  
Pearl.  
Period  
Ma  
Pettit  
Eng  
Pope,

Maas, P., note by, Henry Finch and Shakespeare, 142.

McAdam, E. L., Jr., art. by, Dr. Johnson and Saunders Welch's *Proposals*, 337.

Macdonald, A. See Periodical Literature, and *Annual Bibliography of English Language and Literature*.

McKillop, A. D., *The Background of Thomson's Liberty*, revd., 188.

MacLean, K., *Agrarian Age: A Background for Wordsworth*, revd., 189.

Malone, K. See *Beowulf*.

Margoliouth, H. M., *William Blake*, noticed, 92.

Marlowe, Christopher. See Nosworthy, J. M.

Marvell, Andrew. See Withington, Eleanor.

Mathews, M. M., ed., *A Dictionary of Americanisms on Historical Principles*, revd., 197.

Maxwell, J. C., note by, The Punctuation of *Macbeth*, I. i. 1-2, 356.

Middleton, Thomas. See Johannson, B.

Milton, John. See Kermode, F. (art.); Wright, B. A. (note); Cawley, R. R.; Kirkconnell, W. (revd.).

Mitchell, C. See Hogarth, William.

Molloy, Charles. See Jones, G. H.

Monaghan, T. J., art. by, Johnson's Additions to his *Shakespeare* for the Edition of 1773, 234.

Montagu, Lady Mary Wortley. See Williams, A. L.

Montague, Walter. See Withington, Eleanor.

More, Sir Thomas. See Hexter, J. H.

Mueller, W. R., *The Anatomy of Robert Burton's England*, revd., 285.

Muir, K., ed. *King Lear*, revd., 376.

Mulhauser, F. L. See Clough, Arthur Hugh.

Nicoll, A., ed. *Shakespeare Survey 5*, revd., 161.

Norrington, A. L. P. See Clough, Arthur Hugh.

Nosworthy, J. M., note by, The Publication of Marlowe's *Elegies* and Davies's *Elegygrams*, 260.

Opie, I. and P., edd., *The Oxford Dictionary of Nursery Rhymes*, revd., 195.

Otway, Thomas. See Taylor, Aline M.

Owings, M. A., *The Arts in the Middle English Romances*, revd., 369.

*Oxford Dictionary of Nursery Rhymes*, The, ed. I. and P. Opie, revd., 195.

Parnell, Thomas. See Scriblerus Club.

Patience. See Chapman, C. O.

Pearl. See Chapman, C. O.

Periodical Literature, Summary of, by A. Macdonald, 94, 203, 300, 407.

Pettit, H. J. See *Annual Bibliography of English Language and Literature*.

Pope, Alexander. See Callan, N. (art.); Williams, A. L. (note); Knight, D. (revd.).

See also Scriblerus Club.

Pound, Ezra. See West, T. W.

Powell, L. F. See Boswell, James.

Praz, M. See *English Miscellany*.

Prouty, C. T., *The Sources of Much Ado about Nothing: A Critical Study, together with the Text of Peter Beverley's Ariodante and Leuneura*, revd., 160.

Publications received, List of, 207, 410.

Purity. See Chapman, C. O.

Ray, G. N., *The Buried Life: A Study of the Relation between Thackeray's Fiction and his Personal History*, revd., 394.

Richardson, Samuel. See Sale, W. M., Jr.

Robbins, E. W., *Dramatic Characterization in Printed Commentaries on Terence, 1473-1600*, noticed, 299.

Robbins, R. H., *Secular Lyrics of the XIVth and XVth Centuries*, revd., 154.

Robertson, D. W., and Huppé, B. F., *Piers Plowman and Scriptural Tradition*, revd., 150.

Robertson, Jean. See Breton, Nicholas.

Rossetti, Dante Gabriel. See West, T. W.

Rutherford, Mark. See Stone, W. H.

Sale, W. M., Jr., *Samuel Richardson: Master Printer*, revd., 79.

Sandahl, B., *Middle English Sea Terms*. I. *The Ship's Hull*, revd., 276.

Sarmiento, E., note by, A Parallel between Lord Byron and Fray Luis de León, 267.

Schirmer, W. F., *John Lydgate: Ein Kulturbild aus dem 15. Jahrhundert*, revd., 371.

Scholes, P. A., *The Life and Activities of Sir John Hawkins*, revd., 391.

Scott, Sir Walter. See Heintz, W. W.

Scriblerus Club: *Memoirs of the Extraordinary Life, Works, and Discoveries of Martinus Scriblerus*, ed. C. Kerby-Miller, noticed, 91.

Sehrt, E. T., *Vergebung und Gnade bei Shakespeare*, revd., 281.

Sewell, A., *Character and Society in Shakespeare*, revd., 282.

Shaftesbury, Anthony Ashley Cooper, third earl of. See Aldridge, A. O.

Shakespeare, William, *Henry VI*, ed. J. D. Wilson, revd., 157; *King Lear*, ed. K. Muir, revd., 376.

— See Monaghan, T. J. (art.) [on Johnson's edn. of 1773]; Maas, P., Maxwell, J. C. (notes); Danby, J. F., Hogan, C. B., Hotson, L., James, D. G., Prouty, C. T., Sehrt, E. T., Sewell, A. (revd.); Watkins, W. B. C. (noticed).

Shakespeare: *N.B.L. Book List*, Second Series (generaleditor, Katharine J. Worth), noticed, 404.

*Shakespeare Survey 5*, ed. A. Nicoll, revd., 161.

Shenstone, William: *Shenstone's Miscellany 1759-1763*, ed. I. A. Gordon, revd., 388.

Shirley, James. See Bland, D. S.  
 Sidney, Sir Philip. See Danby, J. F.  
 Simpson, Evelyn M. See Donne, John;  
 Jonson, Ben.  
 Simpson, P. See Jonson, Ben.  
 Sisam, Celia, art. by, An Early Fragment of  
 the Old English *Martyrology*, 209.  
 Spenser, Edmund. See Watkins, W. B. C.  
 Steele, Richard: *The Occasional Verse of  
 R. S.*, ed. R. Blanchard, revd., 289.  
 Stone, W. H., art. by, Browning and 'Mark  
 Rutherford', 249.  
*Studies in Bibliography*. Vol. IV, 1951-2, ed.  
 F. Bowers, revd., 397.  
 Swift, Jonathan: *The Prose Works of J. S.*,  
 ed. H. Davis, Vol. VI, revd., 185. See  
 also Scriblerus Club.  
 Taylor, Aline M., *Next to Shakespeare:  
 Otway's Venice Preserv'd and The  
 Orphan and their History on the London  
 Stage*, revd., 179.  
 Taylor, F. See John Rylands Library.  
*Temperance and Humility*. See Craik,  
 T. W.  
 Tennyson, Alfred, Lord. See Tillotson,  
 Kathleen (art.); Norrington, A. L. P.  
 (note).  
 Thackeray, William Makepeace. See Ray,  
 G. N.  
 Thomas, Mary E., *Medieval Skepticism and  
 Chaucer*, revd., 68.  
 Thomson, James. See McKillop, A. D.  
 Thomson, James (B. V.). See Walker,  
 Imogene B.  
 Tillotson, G., *Criticism and the Nineteenth  
 Century*, revd., 83; ed. *Essays and Studies*,  
 1951, revd., 297.  
 Tillotson, Kathleen, art. by, Rugby 1850;  
 Arnold, Clough, Walron, and *In  
 Memoriam*, 122.  
 Timmer, B. J. See Judith.  
 Towneley Plays. See Williams, A.  
 Trounce, A. McL. See Athelston.  
 Turnbull, G. H., art. by, John Hall's Letters  
 to Samuel Hartlib, 221.  
 Ure, J. M., note by, The *Benedictine Office*  
 and the Metrical Paraphrase of the Lord's  
 Prayer in MS. C.C.C.C. 201, 354.  
 Umbach, H. H. See Donne, John.  
 Vergil, Polydore. See Hay, D.  
 Walker, Imogene B., *James Thomson (B.V.):  
 A Critical Study*, revd., 85.  
 Walron, Theodore. See Tillotson, Kath-  
 leen.  
 Watkins, W. B. C., *Shakespeare and Spenser*,  
 noticed, 90.  
*Wealth and Health*. See Craik, T. W.  
 Welch, Saunders. See McAdam, E. L., Jr.  
 Wells, Evelyn K., *The Ballad Tree: A  
 Study of British and American Ballads,  
 their Folklore, Verse and Music*, revd., 396.  
 West, T. W., note by, D. G. Rossetti and  
 Ezra Pound, 63.  
 Whiper Pamphlets, The. See Daven-  
 port, A.  
 White, Helen C., *The Tudor Books of  
 Private Devotion*, revd., 156.  
 Williams, A., *The Characterization of Pilate  
 in the Towneley Plays*, noticed, 90.  
 Williams, A. L., note by, Pope's 'Duchesses  
 and Lady Mary's', 359.  
 Wilson, F. P., letter on *Gentleness and  
 Nobility*, 67; ed. *Demetrius and Enanthe  
 by John Fletcher* (with M. McL. Cook),  
 revd., 165.  
 Wilson, J. D., ed. *Henry VI*, revd., 157.  
 Wilson, R. M., *The Lost Literature of  
 Medieval England*, revd., 151; ed. *Early  
 Middle English Texts* (with B. Dickins),  
 noticed, 404.  
 Withington, Eleanor, note by, Marvell and  
 Montague: another source for 'The  
 Definition of Love', 261.  
 Woolf, R. E., art. by, The Devil in Old  
 English Poetry, 1.  
 Wordsworth, William: *The Poetical Works  
 of W. W. Poems Founded on the Affec-  
 tions. Poems on the Naming of Places.  
 Poems of the Fancy. Poems of the Imagi-  
 nation*, ed. E. de Selincourt, 2nd edn.  
 [revised by Helen Darbishire], revd., 393.  
 —— See Griggs, E. L. (note); Abercrombie,  
 L., Darbishire, Helen, MacLean, K.  
 (revd.).  
 Worth, Katharine J., ed. *Shakespeare:  
 N.B.L. Book List*, Second Series, noticed,  
 404.  
 Wright, B. A., note by, 'Mainly': *Paradise  
 Lost*, XI, 519, 143.  
 Yeats, William Butler. See Bjersby, Birgit.

);  
h-  
er,  
Jr.  
A  
ds,  
6.  
nd  
en-  
of  
ate  
ses  
and  
the  
(k),  
of  
rly  
ns),  
nd  
The  
Old  
rks  
fec-  
ces.  
agi-  
dn.  
93.  
bie,  
K.  
are:  
ed,  
dise  
rgit.





**CURRENT PERIODICAL SERIES**

**PUBLICATION NO: 1200**

**TITLE:** REVIEW OF ENGLISH STUDIES

**VOLUME:** 5                           **ISSUES:** 17-20

**DATE** 1954

**Notice: This periodical may be copyrighted, in which case the contents remain the property of the copyright owner. The microfilm edition is reproduced by agreement with the publisher. Duplication or resale without permission is prohibited.**

Xerox University Microfilms, Ann Arbor, Michigan

**MICROFILMED – 1975**